

THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XLIII.

JANUARY, 1860.

ARTICLE I.

THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE, DISTINCT FROM THE GENERAL PRIESTHOOD, BUT NO HIERARCHY.

By Professor D. Worley, A. M., Columbus, Ohio.

We have had occasion several times, in self-defence, to declare our conscientious difference from the brethren of the Missouri as well as from those of the Buffalo Synod, on the doctrine of the Ministerial office; by some whom we think a little sensitive in the matter, we have been soundly berated, both privately and publicly, for having done so. We feel it, therefore, due to ourselves, and to the cause of truth, to present a calm expression of truth as we believe it to be found in the Holy Scriptures. We ask only for what we shall present, the unbiased and impartial Christian judgment of all who may have patience enough to follow us through the whole course of our investigation. We shall endeavor, also, to steer entirely clear of bitterness and personality, and while we confess the truth, do it with all proper respect and deference to the views of those who differ from us. We fear that much injury has already resulted to the Church in the extreme warmth, with which this, by no means unimportant, subject has been sometimes hitherto discussed. By the grace of God we hope to be able to speak the truth in love. Our desire is to convince and edify, not to embitter and repel.

A great mistake, it seems to us, has been made in the discussion of this question, in Europe and this country, by the attempts which are so continually made by the representatives of the various views of the Ministerial Office to show that the older divines in our Church, and especially Luther,

was a decided advocate of that particular view which the disputant had himself espoused. The question is one, in regard to which we are clearly convinced, that the views of Luther, never having been given to it directly, will require but little ingenuity to be moulded into that shape which may be required by the strong bias of his particular commentator. Our confessions, too, are not decidedly clear in this subject, because, doubtlessly, there was not as much prominence given it in the days of the Reformers and Fathers, as it has attained in our day. And until it be settled in some manner authoritatively by a general council of the Church, we must solemnly protest against unchurching those, and forbidding them the brotherly fellowship of Lutherans, who do not in all respects, see eye to eye with us touching this doctrine. We do not, of course, undervalue the great necessity and good of seeking after and promoting unity of faith here as well as in other important matters; but unity itself can only result by carefully and prayerfully bringing our differences together, and by holding fast the good, establishing it upon the Word of God, and by rejecting the bad which the Word condemns.

In the discussion of this question, now, therefore, we desire it to be clearly understood, that we have not sought to establish our views of the doctrine of the ministry, upon Luther; nor, as we are fully convinced both of the impropriety and impossibility of establishing open and unsettled Church questions by quotations from the Fathers, especially when, as they are generally, they are mere incidental allusions, will we agree to have our views judged in this manner. This discussion will require us to go back of the Confession and the Fathers, to that upon which the Confessions themselves depend, and upon which they so immovably stand, the Word of God. We love and honor our confessions of faith because they are so clearly and decidedly confessions of truth, presented in the Word; but we feel it a very holy and necessary duty of every son of the Church to guard them from that spirit of proscriptive intolerance which turns every sentence into a necessary element of Lutheranism, even where there is strong room for the belief, that if those who prepared the Confessions originally, had expressed themselves directly and fully in many cases, they would be found holding very different views from those which have been pressed out of incidental and disconnected passages; we fear the danger in this direction almost as much as we fear the influence of those

who have, with unholy touch, attempted to rob the confessions of their chief strength and beauty by *recension*, so called.

We, therefore, propose to leave the Confessions and Fathers in this discussion in the back ground, and examine into the nature and relations of the Ministerial Office by the light of the Holy Scriptures; though we are assured that, as far as the matter is referred to among the former, we shall not be far, if at all, in disagreement with them.

The question of the ministry is without doubt a very important one, in reference to which it is very necessary that we should be clearly and decidedly grounded upon the Word, if we would not, in our Churchly relations, be the subjects of many perplexing and anxious doubts and fears. While it is important on the one hand, that we do not take from God and give to the creature instrument, what is alone due to God; it is just as necessary, that we should not despise the instrumentalities appointed of God, lest we be found therein despising God Himself. Whilst the minister is to us an example of the flock, and, therefore, of it, he is also the servant of God *unto* the flock to guide, direct, and feed it upon the rich pastures of God's Word, and, therefore, *over* it. In a word, whilst the ministry is not a hierarchy, it is not the creature of man; whilst it may not usurp the place of God, it has the authority of God; whilst its purpose is to serve the congregation, it is only this, in so far as God's service calls for it and as He Himself directs it.

In order to a fair and scriptural understanding of the holy office of the ministry, it is necessary that the reader bear with him, through the entire investigation, a clear idea of the Church in its general features and relations. The Church is the communion of saints, the congregation of all believers in every nation and of every tongue, and as such, in its perfect and spiritual form is invisible, for no man is able clearly to discern the hearts of his fellow men and pronounce positively and absolutely whether they be believers or unbelievers; God alone reads the heart and pronounces the judgment which accepts or rejects us as true and living members of the Body of Jesus Christ, though each one of us, who truly submits to the Word of God, has the witness of the Spirit for himself that he is born of God; but inasmuch as the Church is designed for men in the world, who themselves are not yet spiritual and invisible, but consist of body, mind and spirit, there is an absolute necessity in man's nature for a

visible presence or presentation of that which is designed for his welfare and restoration to the image and peace of God. This necessity is amply provided for in the divine institution of the Gospel, in the presence and administration of the Word and Sacraments, submission to which, in their complete and essential integrity, constitutes that confession of Christ upon which the Church is built. And whenever these, the Word and Sacraments, are present and submitted to according to the injunction of the Head of the Church, we have the assurance of His own promise, believers are there and the Church itself is present and established. And in the visible presence of the Word and Sacraments, in their integrity, we have the invisible Church, which is as surely present in the visible congregation where the pure Word and Sacraments are, as the assurances and promises of God Himself are true. His Word does not return unto Him void, but under the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, will accomplish that whereto it is sent, which is the establishment, building up and perfecting of Zion, the Church. Hence it is, doubtless, that our Confession so distinctly says, the Church is where the Word of God is preached in its purity and the Sacraments are administered in accordance therewith; not as some would have it, in so far as these are present. Where the Word is preached, in its integrity, there the pure Sacraments will necessarily also be administered, and where both are, the Church is; they are visible signs of an existing Church in the visible congregation. Without submission to the Word and Sacraments, we cannot ordinarily conceive of the existence of faith or believers, nor consequently of the Church.

The existence of the Church, therefore, requires also the prior presence of the Word of God in its integrity; in the ordinary dealings of God with mankind, and with what *might* be under extraordinary circumstances we have nothing to do, He gives the influence of the Holy Ghost and restores, forgives and sanctifies men alone through the life-giving Word: that which at first spoke man into existence, again in Christ speaks him into a new and living creature. Hence, says the Apostle, How shall they believe except they hear; which is equivalent to saying, How shall there be believers without the hearing of the Word, and without it, how the existence of the Church? And this is to be said not merely as regards the first establishment of the Church and the calling and introduction of believers therein. The Church in this world

is altogether militant; it is in all respects a missionary organization of God, as it were, in a foreign land. It battles against the kingdom of the devil in the world, and seeks to draw immortal souls out of the meshes of Satan and restore them to the kingdom and love of God first; but it never continues to battle against the remains of the kingdom of darkness in the flesh even of believers, and is and must necessarily be ever upon the aggressive. If the Church become lukewarm or lie down in supine negligence, or if individual believers do it, they at once find themselves taken at advantage by the devil, and unless waked up from their lethargy, by the grace of God, they will sooner or later find themselves at his mercy; his victory over them will be completed unto eternal overthrow and destruction. The perfection and growth of believers in the Church, and, consequently, also the perfection and growth of the Church in believers is inseparably connected with the Divine Word in its preached form and in its visible form in the Holy Sacraments. Our Lord, when He prays to the Father, for His followers, says Sanctify them by thy truth, thy word is truth. And the Apostle speaks thus of the Church and of Christ, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. From these and many other Scripture passages which might be quoted, if space allowed, we learn conclusively that the Church is established, built up and perfected through the Divine Word, and hence also that the Word is antecedent both to the establishment and growth of the Church.

Furthermore, if the Word is thus antecedent to the very existence of the Church, and it hath pleased God to present His word in the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, the office, by which these are accomplished, precedes the existence of the Church where yet it is not, and precedes all development of the Church among believers where it does already exist, though united with their imperfections. Hence the Apostolic word, How shall they hear except it be preached, and how shall they preach except they be sent? Christ, Himself, in the Church of the New Testament, is the first and original Teacher. He preached the Gospel, the tidings of great joy, publicly among the people, and at the same time instructed a chosen few from among the many, particularly, that after

His death, resurrection and final departure from the scene of His humiliation, they might continue the ministry which He Himself inaugurated. He authorized and commanded them not only in His relation to the Church as Lord, but also in the relation He sustained to it as prophet or teacher, to carry the tidings of salvation to all men, under every nation and of every tongue. The Apostles and Evangelists whom thus Christ prepared and authorized, themselves, as He had done to them and with them, went abroad after they had received the out-pouring or baptism of the Spirit, and preached publicly among Jews and Gentiles the unsearchable riches of the kingdom and salvation of God, calling men everywhere to the blissful fellowship of new-born creatures in Christ; they also as the form and substance of the Divine authority, with which they were invested, required them to do, committed unto others that with which they were invested, commanding them in like manner to commit the same to those who would be able to transmit it to future generations. God blessed their labors in the rapid spread and triumph of His Church, and from that day to this, has owned and blessed the faithful labors of those, who, invested with His authority, have gone forth among the nations, in His name, preaching Christ and Him crucified. In the teaching and example of the Apostles, and in the teaching and history of the Church in all ages from the Apostolic age to this day, we have indisputable and positive ground for the truth here advanced, viz: that the preaching of the Gospel and the office of preaching precede, and, in the arrangements of God with man, must necessarily precede the existence and development of the Church among men. The necessary and logical deduction from this proposition we leave for future consideration. We merely desire here to impress it upon the mind and attention of the reader.

Again, the Church, though in her spirituality she is invisible, is visibly presented, i. e., in the presence of the Word and Sacraments, and through their preaching and administration her presence is visibly attested to us; and the invisible Church composed of all believers, and thus in the bond of faith, having an internal bond of union and communion with Christ the Head, has in the authorized preachers of the Word, through whose instrumentality the internal bond of faith is begotten and cemented, as the public confessors of the Word, a visible bond of union and communion in all the earth, wherever the true Church has an existence. And in this

sense the apostles and first ministers of Christ, and after them the ministry in all time are, by the authority of God under which they preach and act on the one hand, the representatives of the visible Church on the other; hence the apostolic Synods and the establishment of ministeriums in all ages of the Church to consult, and under the word of God to decide questions of doctrine, and to quell dangerous and wide-spreading heresy and scandal to the Church. And although with regard to many, nay of most things concerning the Church in any given extent of country, the laity are and should be represented, this is to be viewed from an entirely different stand point, and does not at all interfere with the claim that the ministry are by the authority of God, as the public confessors and perpetuators of the truth under God, the stated and steadfast representatives of the Church. In this connection we cannot further go into the scriptural grounds upon which we base this claim, as they are more particularly connected with a portion of our subject not at present under consideration. As we proceed the reader will be more fully able to see the nature of this representation, its scripturality and its necessity for the Church.

Impressing these four positions upon the attention of our readers, viz: that the Church, though invisible as the one, holy Church, is visibly presented and attested by the Word and Sacraments; that the Word must precede the Church; that hence the office of preaching also precedes the Church; and that as the authorized servants of God the ministers of the Word represent the Church, we proceed further to say that the individual congregation, while it has for itself all the rights and immunities of the Church, is not the Church and has no authority to act for other congregations or for the Church in general. Congregations sustain to the Church universal about the same relations which individual members do to the congregation; no individual Christian in the exercise of his scriptural rights in the congregation, can act for others or by his own will determine and act for the congregation; yet he enjoys for himself all the rights and privileges which pertain to the congregation; so while the congregation may enjoy and claim for itself, and even under particular circumstances perform for itself all which appertains to the Church at large, no congregation can dictate or legislate or perform any function pertaining to the Church at large, for other congregations or for the whole Church. All those offices of a general nature, which have regard to pro-

moting and securing the welfare and upbuilding of the whole Church, are of this nature, and can only be properly performed by the Church in her representative capacity, an essential and the only steadfast element of which is the holy ministry, as we have already remarked.

Having thus, as we believe, sufficiently referred to the necessary relations of the Church in so far as they will be required in the further consideration of the ministerial office we present the following chief points, which we propose to discuss in this consideration:

1st. The ministerial office is directly appointed of God, and in the Church militant is an essential requisite to the Church's organization.

2d. There is a twofold call to the ministry; the one part having reference to the office itself, the other to particular administrations under investment with the office.

3d. The general call to the ministerial office, is ordinarily in the hands of those who already hold the office, as the authorized representatives of the Church in this regard.

4th. The call to particular administrations proceeds sometimes from the Church in her representative capacity, and sometimes from the individual congregation wherein a minister is called to labor.

5th. The general call to the ministry is not and cannot be in the congregation.

The Ministerial Office is directly appointed of God, and is essential to the organization of the Church. This proposition is questioned by very few in our Lutheran Zion, perhaps by none in the Church in this country; and were it not for questions and propositions incidentally connected with this principal one, we might let it pass with a simple enunciation. For the sake of these, however, we deem it necessary to speak of it at length.

In the Divine plan for man's deliverance and salvation, God has so ordered the arrangement of His Church, that heavenly treasures are brought to man by human instrumentalities. The Gospel calls all men to salvation, and when its conditions are fulfilled, to the believing and submissive it brings and guarantees forgiveness of sins and eternal life. And with Christ as their pattern, this Gospel has been committed to chosen ones of God, whose office requires them to preach the Gospel tidings publicly to all who will hear, and when these are submitted to, to pronounce to the believer the positive reception of God's grace unto forgiveness and life. This au-

thority, in a general way, was already given to the Evangelists whom Christ first, during His sojourn in the flesh, sent forth to proclaim to those, who looked for the coming of Messiah's kingdom, the tidings of His advent, and the rejoicing truth of which He was at once the embodiment and representative. Though these, doubtlessly, continued in the exercise of the functions of the office thus committed to them, we have, however, no particular record of their work in the Holy Scriptures, because probably their ministry was designed as a temporary one, and was especially included in the more general office of the apostles to which, as of lasting necessity in the Church militant, the Scriptures give chief reference.

But already in the teachings of Christ to His apostles, giving unto them the power of the keys, we have, as well as in their original calling to be the special attendants upon Christ's instructions, particular reference given to the institution of the office of the holy ministry. The representative character of the ministry is also at this place, brought out in a peculiar and public manner. In the 16th chapter of Matthew, Christ speaking with His disciples asks them, Whom say ye that I am? This question is propounded to all of them, but Peter as the representative of all gives the answer, which forms the confession of Christ upon which, a rock, the Church is built; and in like manner and under the same circumstances, the office of the keys, which is the very substance of the Gospel and its ministry, is given unto Peter certainly in no other sense, than, as he became, by his confession of Christ, the representative of the other disciples. These also in the 18th chapter receive the same from Christ, and our Lord addresses them as though they were the embodiment of the Church herself, i. e., as the representative of the Church as well as of Himself in that Church, in the public confession and promulgation of the truth. In the latter case all the disciples are together in this capacity as public confessors of the truth of Christ, and as such now they are all addressed and empowered just as Peter was before. We affirm positively from the Scriptural relation of the subject matter here, that the apostolic office, essentially the office of the ministry as we now have it in the Church, is, as the office of general confession, the office also of general representation to the Church. For either the power of the keys is given to this office as an exclusive prerogative of special men in the Church to be exercised at will, or it is given to all men equally in the Church,

or it is given to the Church in her representative ministry. The first of these three positions cannot be maintained, because, in the exercise of the power of the keys, the minister is positively bound to God's word, and as soon as he departs from it, in that departure he ceases to be the ambassador of Christ. The second likewise must not be admitted, because the authority of exercising this power is nowhere in the Scriptures given to persons in the Church indiscriminately. In accordance with the third, however, and only in accordance with that can these Scriptures be made to harmonize with the Scripture order of salvation; for forgiveness of sins and grace unto eternal life are presented to men through the Church, in the means of grace, which become effective in their administration to him who submits to them, when they are regularly presented to him; the Church built upon the Word confessed and preached, has been entrusted with these means of grace, and she administers them through her special office of ministry, not collectively nor indiscriminately by her members, all of which have not the same office. As in the natural body the vocal organs give forth the general expression of the whole man, so the ministry are the mouth and tongue of the body of Christ, which is the Church.

The direct appointment of the ministerial office, however, only receives its full presentation and perpetual force in the last interview of our Lord with His disciples, previous to His ascension to the right hand of the Father. This is found in the command, Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. We learn from this Scripture that the ministry is essentially the apostolic office. For the office is that of teaching the word and administering the sacraments as instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; this office is here given to the apostles and has been by them, in what manner we shall see hereafter, perpetuated in the regular ministry of the Church. In both the functions to be performed are the same, and hence the office in both is the same. The apostles, too, are not called by, but are sent out for and to the congregations of the Church as through their instrumentality, also, these successively arose upon the Word and Sacraments presented unto them by the ministry of the Word.

We learn here further that the office of publicly teaching and administering the sacraments is not bestowed upon all members of the Church, neither the right and authority of Christ so to do; for special reference is had to the fact that Christ did not give the command to teach and the promise of His accompanying the teaching, to the assembled multitude of His followers, but only to the eleven apostles.

We learn here again the parity of ministers in their office; for neither in the act of empowering the apostles, nor in the present command for them to go forth to the exercise of that power, do we find that any distinction is made among them, nor the preshadowing of such distinction in those who after them should hold and exercise the office. Lacking thus the authority of Christ for their arrogant claims, the Papacy and Episcopacy are alike without foundation for them.

Finally we learn from this passage of Scripture that the apostolic office, that is to say, the ministerial office is perpetual in the Church militant; for the promise: Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, is directly associated with the command to teach and administer the Sacraments.

That the ministerial office is essential to the organization of the Church, should, we think, sufficiently appear from the fact that it is thus explicitly commanded and ordered by the Head of the Church for all time, even unto the end of the world. But aside from this there is inherent necessity for it manifested in the whole tenor of Scripture, teaching concerning the Church and her Divine mission among men. The Holy Ghost comes, and the full and complete blessings of acceptance with the Father and of salvation through His only begotten Son are given to man by the Church's agency, in the means of grace. But these means do not and in the very nature of things cannot come to man without administration; and this again necessitates the ministry. The Apostle Paul most beautifully and forcibly sets this necessity forth in his epistle to the Romans, 10: 13-15. "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach unless they be sent?" With this upon our proposition we leave it to consider the *second*, viz.: There is a two-fold call to the ministry; the one part being the call to

the office itself; the other the call to particular ministrations under investment with the office.

This proposition rests in the very nature of the ministerial office; the ministry are on the one hand the ambassadors of Christ sent forth by Him, invested with his authority, and in the Word and Sacraments representing Him in the Church among believers, and to them also, who are called of God unto salvation, through the Gospel which is preached; on the other hand the minister is the servant of the Church, either in individual congregations or for general purposes as, for example, in missionary labors. It is, therefore, requisite in the first place that he be really empowered of God to represent Him in the publication of the truth and in all that which is consequent upon submission to it. No regular administration of the Word or Sacraments can take place at the hands of an unauthorized person; but when once in the proper manner a man is invested with the office, i. e. has been entrusted with the Gospel; he is ready for such a disposition in administrations as may be required by the peculiar circumstances under which the Church may have need of him. First, a minister by divine right and appointment, he becomes also subject to the rules of order which are found in every well regulated economy, and which, by the Scriptures, are also made essential to the divine economy in its relation to man's redemption and salvation. The ministerial office does not exist merely as an arrangement of the Church for the sake of order; it is of divine appointment and the Church is not at liberty to use it or dispense with it as her own desire or opinion of expediency may determine; the office is expressly given her and its use enjoined upon her generally, while at the same time its exercise is committed to particular persons for her benefit; but when these are once in the office, then they also come under the requirements of decency and order for the ministry, just as individual believers are bound to submit to the order of the congregation or Church in general; they first become believers through the gracious work of the Holy Ghost, in submission by faith to the regularly appointed means of grace; and then in necessary consequence as believers they are subject to the requirements of order in the Church.

This distinction again between the office in general and its particular administration grows out of the necessity in our congregational and general churchly operations to provide against deception and abuse. We are commanded to beware

of wolves who come to us in sheep's clothing, against false teachers whilst we must submit to those who are regularly placed over us in the Church by the Lord. But how is the congregation, say for instance, to be assured that one coming to them is not a wolf? It is not to be expected that our church members generally have that intimate acquaintance with human nature, and the mental and moral aptitudes and powers required by the Scriptures in a minister, which enables them to form even a comparatively safe judgment of those who may come among them claiming to be servants of God. Nor is it in accordance with the spirit of God's will to man in this regard, that the Church be exposed to so much uncertainty and even positive danger. He has provided, first, that there be the general office of preaching for which there are certain specified qualifications necessary, and, secondly, that this office be bestowed and perpetuated in such manner as to avoid those dangers, which are otherwise associated with the weakness and perversity of human nature, fallen and corrupt. Whilst they who set up for themselves, and undertake to be the judges in all things of the qualifications of those whom they desire to break unto them the Word of God, are oftentimes, nay, generally disappointed and deceived, even where they are not, in time, which also often happens, entirely perverted from the right way; those who make it a rule to receive none as evangelists and teachers, except those who come to them clothed with the proper authority, are comparatively safe. We point to Congregationalism as a fair exemplification of the tendency of the former system, which it is well known among Churchmen has so degenerated in the progress of a few score years, as to be now scarcely distinguishable from heterodoxy of the radical order. Individual exemplifications of the same will occur to every reader. We do not say, of course, that it is absolutely certain, that those who hold the office under the sanction of a regularly constituted Ministerium, will in all cases be true teachers and without danger to our believing people; we do say, however, that in and from them there is comparative safety. The probabilities for deception in the introduction into the office, and of discovery afterward in the case of those who unworthily obtrude themselves, are very greatly increased.

Again, in the authority and investment of the Apostles, in the original establishment of the apostolic or ministerial office, we have an exemplification of this principle given us in the Holy Scriptures. In the command, Go ye forth, &c.,

they were invested with the office, although they were not permitted to go forth to its exercise, but in accordance with the express command of Christ they remained at Jerusalem for a specified time to await the giving of the Holy Ghost, under whose influence and guidance they went forth afterwards as they were appointed and directed. In the calling of the Apostle Paul, this distinction is still more clearly and pointedly expressed. When, yet a persecutor of believers, he was on his way to Damascus with authority from the chief priests to bind all them who called upon the name of the Lord, the already ascended Jesus appeared unto him in the way, heard the prayer of Paul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and directed him to Ananias for the necessary instruction. To Ananias, also, the Lord announced that Saul was a chosen vessel to bear His name among the Gentiles, and when he came Ananias received him and did as he had been directed. That this was Paul's call to the ministry in general, is seen from the fact, that "he straightway *preached* Christ." That he himself so considered it, is proved by the authority which he claimed for himself as an Apostle of Christ by the will of God, without even the agency of man; instance, Gal. 1: 1, Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither *by man*, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead. But whilst thus Paul was authorized *in general* for the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, we find him afterwards *specially* set apart for a special ministry by the laying on of the hand of the other teachers at Antioch. As they ministered to the Lord, it is said, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus." Acts 13: 2-4. It is true that the Scriptures give us ground to believe, that in some cases the two parts of the call to the ministry were conjoined and given at the same time, though even here the language is such as to indicate the distinction. For example on the tour of Paul and Barnabas related in the 14th and 15th chapters of Acts, we find that as they passed along from city to city, comforting and instructing the disciples, and organizing the Churches, it is said: And when they (i. e., the apostles) had ordained them (i. e., for the Churches) elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on

whom they believed. Acts 15: 23. Here we have the ordination of elders by the apostles, and *for* the congregations brought out distinctly and yet in connection. Under both, viz: the authority of God in the laying on of the hands of the apostles and the desire of the believing people to have them for teachers and guides, the elders or pastors received, held and exercised the office of the Holy Ministry.

We conceive the general call to the ministry to be met in ministerial ordination after due preparation and examination of the candidate, and the special call to be given in Synodical or congregational election and installation. By ordination we do not understand merely, neither essentially the laying on of hands, which, however, as a good and wholesome regulation of the Church should not be disregarded, but that divinely commanded examination and setting apart of men to this holy office, whereby they are invested with the authority of Christ to preach the Gospel, administer the Sacraments, and exercise the power of the keys in accordance with the Word. When one is set apart, say for special missionary purposes, or for pastoral services, the second part of the call or installation properly is in place; its form is immaterial, but it is desirable that, as in apostolic times, it too should be accompanied with prayer and the laying on of hands. Ordination from its very nature takes place only once, but installation may take place as often as the scene of a minister's labors among congregations is changed or the special calling is itself changed. We remark finally that we find in the practice of the Church in all ages, not only in the days of the apostles, this distinction of the general call to office, from the special call to ministration in the office. In the further consideration of this two-fold call in succeeding propositions, this fact will be sufficiently considered, and we leave it now with the whole proposition to the reader's consideration.

The *third*, and next proposition in our course, is this: the general call to the ministerial office, is ordinarily in the hands of those who already hold the office, as the authorized representatives of the Church in this regard. To the discussion of this proposition we now ask the reader's serious and close attention; for on the proper understanding of this hangs the whole question of the ministerial office. The office of teaching and administering the Word as we have already shown, of necessity and according to the Scriptures precedes the congregation itself and christian development in the con-

gregation, after it has once been organized. It is, therefore, an office of a general nature to the Church at large; and in his authority to teach and administer, the ambassador of Christ is not confined to time and place; but, by the power of Him whom he represents in the preaching of the Word, it is his duty to go wherever an effectual door is opened him for his labors. This appointment, therefore, must either proceed directly from Christ Himself, or from Him in that part of the Church's general organization, wherein He is himself represented in His Word and Sacraments as the Head of the body. For besides its being an office of a general nature, the ministry presents and, therefore, also, in the Word represents Christ before and in the world for the forgiveness of sin and the salvation of the soul. The office of the ministry is, too, the only office of this general nature which the Holy Scriptures recognize and the only one thus representing Christ; though nothing, in this expression, is to be so understood as that lay-members of the Church are not to represent Christ in the example which He has given us, in fervent prayers, in deeds of charity and love, and in the practice of all christian holiness, before the world; as ambassadors of Christ, however, they do not do it, but merely as bearing about in their own bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus, inciting others to the praise of God by their own good and holy works, those which by grace the new man in them is enabled to bring forth. But it is clearly seen from the Holy Scriptures, that apart from the first authorization of the seventy evangelists for a special purpose, our Lord Himself directly appointed to the general office of preaching only the apostles, including the Apostle Paul. Their successors were appointed in due order by themselves, and directed to ministrations by them with the brethren, either in missionary labor or for particular congregations as they desired. This we have now to establish upon the sure foundation of the Scriptures; its establishment will also render a consideration of direct appointment by Christ to the holy office unnecessary, for if we find universally in the practice of the Apostles that they appointed and authorized as the ambassadors of Christ, those upon whom the office was to descend, we may fairly conclude that as Christ did not then directly appoint, neither have we any right to expect it now.

We base our third proposition first upon this, viz: that our Lord in appointing the twelve and authorizing them to represent Him after His ascension to heaven, in the preach-

ing of the Word, also invested them with authority to *perpetuate* the office thus committed unto them. If the Apostles had acted without such authority from Christ and had merely perpetuated the office as a very good one for the purposes of order, and in their capacity merely as an important part of the congregation in which they labored, then the office of the ministry would necessarily also have been subject to the same rules of order and expediency to which other offices of this character in the congregations were subject. When the immediate necessity which called them into being ceased, the congregation was at perfect liberty to suspend, or totally abolish the offices thus created; as, for instance, the office of deacons for the distribution of the alms of the congregation. This office may be either temporarily suspended, totally abolished, or increased in the sphere of its duties, and yet the Church not be affected at all, as to her essential integrity. But the command of Christ establishing the office and the teaching of the Apostles concerning its necessity, as well as this necessity itself clearly show that the office of the ministry is not of this temporary character. Its duties in the church militant always remain the same as definitely established by the Word of God; therefore, also there is always the same necessity for the office itself. Now Christ, in the command wherewith He authorized and sent forth the Apostles first, has also invested them with authority for the perpetuation of the office. He commands them, in the first place, to go into all the world; for the purpose, in the second place, of preaching the Gospel to every creature; assured, in the third place, that He is with them always, and even unto the end of the world. Either of them, and all these propositions together, most positively preclude the idea that this was addressed to the Apostles in their individual capacity; for neither did they, nor could they themselves go into *all* the world, preach the Gospel to *every* creature, and *unto the end of the world* be assured that Christ was with them in authority and power. They were mortals like ourselves, and were subject like us to wear out in process of time, and die, even as they have done, before this more than Herculean labor has been performed. On the other hand, however, this authority was not given to the whole body of believers, for as we have already seen, it was declared to and conferred upon the eleven, when Jesus by appointment met them, and not the believers generally, as it seems, for

this very purpose. Matt, 28 : 16—20. The only logical deduction, therefore, that can be made from the whole passage is this, that it was addressed to the eleven as those from whom, until the end of time, yet under Christ, in themselves and in those to whom they committed the authority by the will of Christ, the office of preaching should go forth, bearing in its hands the gracious blessings of salvation to the whole perishing world, and until the Church militant was completely and fully taken up into the Church triumphant.

We base our proposition in the second place upon the practice of the Apostles which, without exception, is in accordance with this our deduction from the command of Christ Himself. This practice most fully and completely corroborates the deduction. Were it not so, and did we find that as a general thing they in their practice referred the appointment of ministers, teachers and pastors to the whole congregation of believers we would have good reason to doubt our conclusion drawn from the circumstances, under which Christ gave this office to the Apostles, and the nature of the office itself as then given. But with this practice before us in the Scriptures we are most firmly and positively assured that Christ intended it so to be, viz: that the authorization of public teachers in the Church should proceed from those whom He had appointed already to the office. We have before called attention to the fact that Paul and Barnabas thus appointed and authorized, by virtue of the power of the office which they had received of the Lord, teachers or pastors in the congregations whithersoever they went. Acts 14: 23. That the word Elder here used is only another word to represent just what the word Bishop does, compare 1 Tim. 3: 2-7, with Titus 1 : 5-9. In Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, chap. 1, he puts him "in remembrance to stir up the gift of God which is in him by the putting on of his own, i. e., Paul's, hands," and, therefore, also commands him to "hold fast the form of sound words, which he had heard" of Paul, thus showing that Paul, by virtue of the grace given him of the Lord Jesus in bestowing upon him the office of an Apostle, also instructed and appointed Timothy to the holy office.

He also prefaces his charge to Titus by calling him his own son, after the common faith, without doubt reminding Titus that as he himself had been the instrument of God, through whom he had received the office, he ought to give the more diligence to the admonitions which Paul gave him con-

cerning its administration. That Paul in thus setting apart teachers in the Church did not act alone, nor with the co-operation of the congregation, but with other presbyters or teachers, is seen from this, that the same gift which above is confided to Timothy by the laying on of his hands is also in 1 Tim. 4:14, said to have been conferred by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, that is, a number of teachers associated together for this purpose. But we find that the Apostles were authorized to go even further than this, and commanded those whom they had appointed as teachers, to appoint others in like manner after them in all time. Thus Paul says to Titus, chap. 1:5, that he had left him in Crete to ordain elders or bishops in every city, according to certain specified qualifications following. To Timothy, also, he says, 2 Tim. 2:1-2: "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the things, that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." When to this we add the fact, that in connection with the direction to set apart teachers as he himself had done, Paul gives to Timothy and Titus, the particular qualifications which they are to look for in proper candidates for the holy office, and commands them to use great circumspection in the exercise of this right, we have the strongest scriptural assurance, as to what construction the Apostles placed upon the authority with which Christ invested them, and the course which they took in its exercise. Besides the passages describing the qualifications which an elder or bishop is to have, to which we have already referred the reader in a former part of this article, we here introduce only one more to indicate the circumspection which Paul charged, in the appointment of ministers to the holy office, not upon the congregations, but upon those who already held it and who, as we have before seen, had, therefore, the authority of Christ to perpetuate it according to the Divine Word. 1 Tim. 5:22. "Lay hands suddenly on no man." This is the direction of Paul to Timothy; and that it has particular reference to ministerial ordination, we think is conclusively established by the fact that in the general charge given Timothy concerning various parts of the different churches under his supervision, this forms the conclusion of the direction having reference to the elders. This whole view of the case is greatly confirmed and strengthened when we consider that the charges concerning the setting apart of new ministers, is always in the Holy Scriptures

given to those already in the office, and neither by Christ nor His Apostles, to individual congregations or the whole assembly of believers. The instance concerning which so much has been made, viz: the election and ordination of an Apostle in the place of the traitor Judas, we are very clearly persuaded by several considerations, is not a real exception to this rule. These considerations are first, that while it is said that one hundred and twenty believers were gathered together, a goodly number of these were undoubtedly women, who, in apostolic times, as in all proper Churchly relations since, were not allowed a voice in these or other public matters; and it is both possible and probable that apart from the women, the evangelists and Apostles under the general name of Disciples formed the whole company of these believers. Again, the Apostle Peter, in his address upon the occasion does not call upon the whole company to take part in the choice but merely announces to them the necessity, in accordance with prophecy, that such choice be made. In the third place, the language in the latter part of the relation is such that it cannot be said beyond question to include all present in the vote or lot which was cast. The probability is that only the Apostles took part in the choice and out of the company of the Evangelists, or perhaps others who were present, they made that choice. To say the very least, it is not in accordance with sound interpretation of the Scriptures to suffer a doubtful passage, where it is not introduced especially to indicate the distinction between the rights of congregations or believers generally and ministers, to disqualify and overthrow a clear and positive teaching of the Scriptures applied to the very purpose of showing how ministers, and not believers generally, are to proceed in vesting others with the authority to preach and administer the Sacraments. From these considerations we conclude beyond question, that the practice of the Apostles and early ministers of the Church was altogether in accordance with our third proposition, and that they understood the authority with which our Lord invested them just as we do now.

We might also base our proposition upon the analogy which the christian ministry in the Church of the New Testament sustains to the Priesthood of the Old Testament. For while there is a great distinction to be drawn between the old covenant and the new in the essence of their whole relation, there is in this, which is the antitype of that, a strong resemblance in many, we might almost say in all of the ar-

rangements of both. We refer, for instance to the analogy, which Circumcision in the old and Baptism in the new, very clearly hold with each other; to the Paschal Supper in the old as analogous to the Lord's Supper in the new, and from these alone, we might draw antecedent probability, that in the case of administrations, and the relations of the administrators, there would also hold an analogy in both. The Priesthood having charge of the service of the Temple and the Synagogues, were of the tribe of Levi, and the descent was from parents to children in this tribe as to those who should hold the office of Priests in the public service of God, for the people. So there is probability that the Christian Ministry would have a spiritual descent conferred upon them for the perpetuation of the office with which they have been entrusted by the Lord of the Church as well of the old as of the new covenant. It is true that a great part of the duty of the Levitical Priesthood consisted in attending to the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and that in the New Testament Christ our sacrifice has been offered once for all, and the sacrifice needs no constant repetition as with them; but their sacrifices were to them, in the regular administration, types and means, through which by faith they were united unto the true sacrifice, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the World; and the New Testament Scriptures abundantly testify, that we must be made specially partakers, in the means provided for the purpose, and in their proper administration, with the same Atoning Lamb. The difference is, that whilst they reached the reality through types and shadows, we come directly, in the appointed means, to the reality which is therein presented us. In both cases, however, particular administration is established and in this we place our analogy, though by no means identity, of the Ministry of the New Testament with the Levitical Priesthood of the Old Testament. This probability might not be of much worth standing alone and by itself without New Testament corroboration; but with this as it has already been presented from the New Testament it becomes an absolute certainty.

Before concluding the discussion of this part of our subject, we think it is necessary to warn the readers and all true inquirers after truth, against the ghost of hierarchy which may possibly be rapped out from the shades to frighten them from a fair consideration of the grounds advanced in favor of the views which we think the Holy Scriptures teach here. There

is a hierarchy of popular, mob suffrage, as well as of individual arrogance and assumption, against both of which our readers will find us in the further progress of our discussion equally guarded on the immovable basis of the Scriptures. We have not consciously endeavored to wrest any Scripture from its literal force and meaning, and we are much better satisfied to follow the clear exposition of God's Holy Word, than to seek a more popular standing by any private interpretations, which with the Apostle Peter, and in the same sense, we hold in utter abhorrence, as the very engine of evil in the hands of Satan, in his opposition to the truth, and the Holy Church of God built up and established upon that truth.

Besides the general call to the ministerial office, we have before shown that there is a second call, to those invested with the office, to particular ministrations. Our fourth proposition is, that the call to particular administrations proceeds in some cases from individual congregations, and sometimes from the Church in general in her representative capacity. This we now proceed to notice at length.

We have already seen that the minister sustains a two-fold relation to the congregation, as does the ministry to the Church. He is, on the one hand, the ambassador, or representative in the Word, of Christ among those to whom he is sent and over whom the Holy Ghost makes him overseer; in the second place, however, he is by reason of his relation of teacher to the people, also their representative, in the public worship of God. The minister is not allowed to lord it over God's heritage, but is admonished to be the helper of their joy and an ensample of the whole flock. Whilst he is the servant of Christ to the people, he is their servant also for Christ's sake. From these considerations it inevitably follows, that the ministry are not invested with hierarchical power to bind burdens upon the people and to exercise arbitrary control over them even in spiritual matters. On the one hand, while all are required to give the ministry that respect and obedience, which is demanded by the Word of God, in the proper exercise of its functions, the ministry, on the other, are bound to exercise towards their people that respectful consideration and tender solicitude which, for example, our Savior Himself always manifested towards His followers, or that the head of a family shows towards the family itself. These two relations of minister and people are perfectly compatible with each other, and the Ho-

ly Scriptures make them, in most unmistakable terms, positively obligatory upon each one in his respective station. Out of them also flow the respective rights of minister and congregation. In our present connection this right is such, that while the congregation is not authorized to invest any man finally with the office, no minister, on the other hand, has the right to intrude himself upon the congregation against its will.

This position still further grows out of the requirements of order in administration. Several pastors may be equally entitled to hold and exercise the office and have equal ministerial authority; but one may be a suitable laborer in one part of the vineyard, whilst he is totally unfit for other positions; he should, therefore, according to every principle of right and order, be assigned to that part of the Master's service to which his capacities direct him; to assign him a portion to which he is unsuited, would be detrimental both to himself and to those with whom he was designed to serve. Those who are immediately acquainted with the circumstances under which any pastor will be called to labor are the best judges of his fitness for the given field. Then, whilst neighboring ministers may be in a position to recommend a pastor to any given people, the people themselves, in the end, are the best and most proper judges of what special qualifications their charge will require, and to call to administrations among them, therefore, can most properly in such cases proceed from themselves. We know that the people, in giving such call, are sometimes very much mistaken and even make up their estimate of a pastor on very wrong grounds; but the probability of mistake in the case is much less than in any other; and the requirement of order will consequently be thus much better fulfilled.

But we further think, that this view of the special call of ministers is taught and encouraged by the Holy Scriptures. The Apostles while they themselves ordained elders or bishops in the churches, whithersoever they went, did it as the Scriptures expressly say for the congregations; thus indicating that while the authority to preach came from themselves under Christ, the choice of the people was to be consulted, and by no means disregarded. The Church of Christ is universally represented as a kingdom in which, however, the administration of the Lord's government, while it is committed to earthen vessels, is one of limited, constitutional power within whose restraints all ministrations are necessarily con-

fined, and the subjects of the kingdom at the same time are called to the enjoyment of constitutional freedom or liberty. In the kingdom of Christ we are delivered from the slavery of Satan to the liberty of the children of God; and the blessings which we enjoy in it are not those of constraint, which would greatly tend to destroy their blessedness, but they are the blessings of privilege, and the freedom of their enjoyment is the great increase of the bliss. It is thus that Christ and the Apostles represent His kingdom to men; and in no case do they teach, or does their teaching imply, that men, in passing from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of Christ, are delivered merely, even in this life, from the satanic bondage to be slaves of hierarchy or priesthood. On the other hand, however, the Church is not left to the wild and changing will of men; her policy and arrangements in their essentiality are fixed and determined. Both of these views, which form the view in which the Church is presented to us in the Scriptures, only harmonize when we combine our third and fourth propositions; viz: the ministerial office is perpetuated by and through the ministry itself, as the command of Christ and the practice of the Apostles teach us; but the call to particular administrations to those who already hold the office proceeds from the congregation in which the administrations are to be exercised.

The Apostolic practice of recommending faithful pastors to the people whenever they sent them, and of exhorting the people to receive and treat them well for their work's sake, instead of arbitrarily commanding them to receive those sent, under peril of displeasure and punishment, goes also to establish our fourth proposition. If the Apostles claimed the authority to place over the people whom they desired, without consulting the will of the people at all, they would have directly commanded the reception of such as they sent to the different congregations; the fact that they did not do so, but addressed them in the tone of recommendation and exhortation, i. e., addressed their freedom of choice, shows conclusively that the congregations had the right to exercise such choice.

We find the same truth verified in the directions which are given to the people to beware of false teachers, wolves in sheep's clothing, who might intrude themselves among them or come to them, with a fair outward show and perhaps even the pretence of Apostolic authority, which some of them undoubtedly formerly possessed. The necessity which

called for these warnings in the days of the Apostles is one which will endure as long as the Church endures, even to the end of time, for in the last times the Apostles themselves warn us, that these false teachers will be many, bringing in damnable heresies. The congregations are taught to try all such spirits and hearken not to the strange voice of those who come to them with new-fangled notions and doctrines of men ; they are to beware of them, and reject them, even though an angel from heaven should herald them. This right is also here closely connected with the relation sustained by single congregations to the universal Church. All the privileges of the Church in general, the individual Christian congregation possesses for herself. While, therefore, it is the duty of the Church in general to provide for the preservation of pure doctrine and the rejection of heresy and error, it is the right of each congregation to guard herself against the false and to preserve unto herself the true, which the whole Church acknowledges and teaches. The Church in her ministerial, representative character must take pains to prevent wolves from entering the holy office, whilst she provides good and approved teachers in general ; and this right becomes in the congregation also requisite, and its exercise is called forth, when pastors are to be introduced among them, or when having been so introduced they, at any time depart from the faith and promulgate false doctrines. This necessarily implies the right of the congregation to call the services of the Pastor, as well as to dispense with them for good and sufficient reasons.

Upon these grounds we think the one part of our fourth proposition is fairly and scripturally established. It remains for us to establish the other part, viz : that sometimes this call to special ministration proceeds from the representative Church, including, as the case may be, at times lay as well as ministerial representatives. Besides particular pastorates and pastoral services which call for the exercise of the holy office, the Church is called upon in the very establishment of the office to look to general interests and teaching, where congregations are not yet in existence. There are Home and Foreign Missionary operations which the Church, without neglect of duty, cannot regard as indifferent and pass by. The command of Christ is, "*Go into all the world.*" And whilst the obligation thus to go rests upon them to whom the office itself has been entrusted ; there is a corresponding obli-

gation upon the Church to send them forth on their holy mission and to provide for them in its fulfillment; for "How shall they preach except they be sent?" And as this part of special ministrations is to be carried out where the gospel has not yet entered, and where, consequently, there are not yet congregations, it devolves upon the Church in general to provide and send forth suitable laborers into this part of the Master's vineyard. This indeed is the prior work of the Church, and it is by no means an exceptional work. It is all right and proper that we provide for the preservation of the pure word and sacraments in the congregations already established, but the obligation to go forth, and carry forward the conquests of the Redeemer's kingdom is consistent with the former; whilst that receives our careful attention, this may not by any means be omitted. The Master has committed the whole work into our hands, and all parts of it must be performed, to merit the plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servants." Before we can have congregations, they must be established; they are established by the preaching of the Word; it is the duty of the Church already established to extend herself thereby into all lands; and until this is accomplished, Missionary labor will have in accordance with Christ's commands and Apostolic teaching and practice a superior claim upon the Church. Christ Himself first called the Apostles to this general labor, who after their call, went forth; they also afterwards sent forth from their own number, as well as from others, upon whom they had conferred the office those who should carry the Gospel where the glad tidings had not yet been borne. See, for exemplification, the sending forth of Paul and Barnabas, as related in Acts 13. As it was then done, so now is it the duty of the Church to provide for Missionary labor.

Growing out of the necessity to provide teachers and pastors with the proper qualifications, is the requirement of institutions of learning where our young men of the proper physical, mental and moral qualifications may be prepared for the duties of the holy office. This necessity, to be sure, is not absolute, but relative; we might get along and prepare ministers without Colleges and Theological schools; but experience teaches that the encouragement and support of schools of a high order is not only of great benefit to the Church, but a comparative necessity; without them the Church cannot so fully and so successfully carry on the great work of the world's evangelization committed to her hands. The pro-

vision of such schools, therefore, and the calling of suitable men to preside over them, and instruct the young men confided to them by the Church becomes a part of her duty. From the nature of the case this cannot be accomplished by individual congregations, but by the Church in her representative capacity.

In these respects and in others, which the length of this article precludes us from noticing particularly, the reader will readily see the necessity for the second part of our proposition, and with this we dismiss it.

It yet remains for us to establish our last proposition, viz: that the call to the ministerial office neither grows out of, nor has any direct connection with the spiritual, general priesthood of believers. We do not, of course, deny that there is such a priesthood of believers; on the contrary, we hold it as one of the special and glorious treasures which by God's grace are bestowed upon all who are united in full and living communion with our Lord Jesus Christ, that there is no longer need of a mediating priest between man and God, but that now every believer may directly present unto God the sacrifices, which are well pleasing in His sight. But we do claim that this priesthood has no connection whatever with the holy office of the ministry, and that this is something entirely and essentially different from that.

This will appear evident, we think, in the first place, from a comparison of the objects of the two things. If we find two things presented in the Scriptures without any connection stated as existing between them, when at the same time, they propose to effect different objects and aims, it would be extremely abhorrent to all true rules of Biblical rendering to say, that the two had the same aim, or that one owed its existence, directly or indirectly to the other. The prime and essential object of the ministerial office is, beyond doubt, that of teaching or preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments. "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is the command of Christ, establishing the office; "a bishop (or minister) must be apt to teach" the Apostle gives as one of the requirements to the holy office. Now the question naturally arises, does the Scriptural presentation of the general priesthood propose any such object, or make any such requirement? The Holy Scriptures give us a very clear negative: Peter says, in his first Epistle, 2: 9, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar

people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light;" in the 5th verse he says, in like manner, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." John also says, Rev. I: 5-6, "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever," language evidently which has reference only to believers. In none of these passages, either in direct or remote connection with them is the office of the ministry mentioned, or anything said of teaching which is the object of that office. Nay, in every respect the two relations and their objects are different; the one, the general priesthood is the right of all believers, the other requires special qualifications in addition; the one is the privilege of rendering service acceptably unto God as believers, the other is the office through which believers are made and established; in the one, *man* renders acceptable prayer and praise unto God, in the other, *God* comes down mercifully and graciously unto man; indeed the only connection that can be drawn from the Scriptures between them is, that through the office of teaching or the ministry, in the Word, God makes believers in His Church, who, then, as believers, and in no other capacity, are enabled through grace to serve God acceptably by prayer, praise and thanksgiving. If more than this is given to the general priesthood, we have entirely failed of finding it in the Scriptures. Neither is there here anything said, directly or indirectly, to the effect, that it is one of the prerogatives of the general priesthood to call ministers to the office. We know of no rule of interpreting language which will render the words, "offer up spiritual sacrifices unto God," or "show forth the praises of Him," equivalent to the right of calling and authorizing ministers in and for the Church. And not finding it in the language of the Scriptures which treats of the general priesthood, either expressed or implied, we must with all due deference to the brethren who think differently, suggest that they have strained the Scriptures to make a point which they do not even propose to make; and as such we must reject it.

Again, upon the plea that the call to the ministerial office must proceed from the whole congregation as a matter pertaining to their rights as spiritual priests, the office itself is degraded from its proper place in the Church organization, and ceases

as an object of administration in which God deals with man, being merely a representative office of the congregation in their general or public sacrifices. No body of men can give authority for more than they possess themselves; it is not in the power of the congregation to confer rights which they themselves do not possess, or which the Scriptures have not given them in this or some other capacity. If, then, upon the ground that all believers are a spiritual priesthood, it is claimed that they are empowered to call men to the ministerial office, it must be because either this right has been expressly granted them, or that the office has no greater authority than pertains to the congregation, or to the individual believers of which it is composed. This right is certainly not directly granted them; then the office of the ministry upon this supposition, has no higher duties, or authority, than belongs to every spiritual priest, i. e., to every believer.

What then becomes of teaching and administration? They are certainly not granted to believers generally, if for no other reason, because all have not the specified qualifications; spiritual priests, or believers are allowed to offer the sacrifices of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving to God for themselves in Christ; but inasmuch as they cannot confer upon others more than they themselves possess, and man is dead in trespasses and sins, and cannot move in the work of his own salvation; there is no arrangement upon this supposition by which God will deal with man and form for Himself believers to praise Him. No! the office of teaching and administration is the glory of the Church's organization, and while it takes away from the spiritual priesthood none of its special glory, neither does it borrow its light and authority therefrom. There is a spiritual priesthood; but distinct from it, yea, going before it, is the office of reconciliation, for whose perpetuation, as we have already seen, the Head of the Church has made special preparation and instituted a certain order.

Nor will it relieve the matter to tell us, that while all are priests, it is an order from Christ, that only special ones shall be called to its exercise for the sake of order. The same difficulty will meet us here that arose before. No rule of order will allow the sum total of believers in any given locality to confer upon others more than what has been committed to them. And further still if it be a question of order which gives to one man the right to teach and administer and forbids others so to do, we would like to know why all

are not permitted to teach and administer without a call at all, when it is done decently and in order. If all are spiritual priests and as such have the authority to preach, no rule of order will justify the congregation in depriving him of it, who feels disposed to its exercise, when he does not interrupt any other; and where then is the necessity of the Apostolic, earnest injunction to lay hands suddenly on no man, or indeed the office of bishop at all? In this case every man is his own judge of a call to preach; and they that interfere with him, deprive him of a God-given right. Yet more: women equally with others are priests, i. e., a part of the spiritual priesthood, and upon this supposition they not only should take part in giving the call, but may themselves claim equally with men the exercise of the duties of the office; for in treating of the *priesthood of believers* the Apostles make no distinction between believers; though we are not at all forgetful of the fact that women are directly forbidden to take any part in the *office of teaching*.

Again, if the office grows out of the spiritual priesthood, we have the thing made, making that through which it is made; or thus believers are made, as the Apostle teaches, through preaching, but preaching itself is made by believers. The ministerial office always precedes the congregation; if then the congregation invests with the authority to preach and itself comes from preaching, it must have existed before itself. Neither does it alter the question to say, that this applies merely to missionary labor and in lands which have not yet heard the Gospel; for, without discrimination the ministerial office is made by the Scriptures a missionary arrangement, through which the Lord first makes believers, and then confirms and strengthens them; and the language with regard to ministers in general is *sent*, not *made*; for how shall they preach except they be sent? the Apostle Paul inquires.

To the cry of hierarchy which may possibly be again raised from these as well as other Scriptural positions which we have taken, we will only here yet add, as closely connected with this part of our subject, that mobocracy will necessarily spring from the position we are combating. The minister will necessarily be merely the servant of the congregation, and the power being in their own hands, whenever he ceases to meet *their* expectation, the same order which induced them to give him the office will in inevitable disorder enable them to depose him and rid themselves of unpopular preaching.

and unpleasant truths. This, again, will act back upon the ministry, and instead of a high and scriptural-toned style of preaching, the pulpit will become a stage for the exhibition of literary excellence, beautiful oratory, and popular flattery. That such would be the case the Apostle Paul seems very pointedly to intimate when he says, in the second Epistle to Timothy, 4: 3-4, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables." It is also a very significant fact that this is the only passage of New Testament Scripture which directly refers to the people, making and authorizing their own ministers; and in this connection, it is of great value, showing that it is under delusion and not according to the truth, that congregations can at any time undertake the final authorization of those who are to perform the functions of the ministerial office. It is not necessary here to direct the reader's attention to instances illustrating this position; though we could easily do it, indeed they are so abundant, that each one can see them on every side. A Ministerium may abuse power entrusted to them by the Head of the Church; a usurpation of that power by the congregation, however, beginning in wrong, will be far more destructive to the peace and prosperity of the Church. A popular hierarchy is the most dangerous of all.

We have now taken the reader over the whole ground which we proposed to ourselves in the discussion of this subject. In concluding, we desire merely to give a general view of the ground and to refer briefly to the witness which is incidentally given to our positions by the Symbolical Books. The office of the Holy Ministry has been instituted of Christ; its purpose is the establishment and building up of the Church in all lands and among all people through the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. The Church is comprised of all believers, i. e., of all those who have and submit to the Word and Sacraments in their purity; and whilst she, as far as individuals are concerned, is invisible, she is visibly attested in the presence of a pure Word and pure Sacraments. See Augsburg Confession, Art. 7. Also, the Apology, Art. 4, particularly in Eng. Ed. pp. 218, 219 and 220. The latter part of this reference only we quote here, as follows: "Nor are we speaking of an imaginary Church, which may nowhere be found, but we affirm

and know, in truth, that this Church containing saints truly is and continues to be on earth; that is, there are children of God in different places throughout the world, in various kingdoms, islands, countries and cities, from the rising to the setting of the sun, who truly know Christ and the Gospel; and we assert that the external signs, the ministry, or the Gospel and the Sacraments are in this Church."

As the Church is built up of believers, and believers are made through the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments, the ministerial office precedes both the existence and development of the Church in any given locality, and hence is not a local but a general office in and to the Church at large. Here compare Articles 5 and 7 of the Augsburg Confession.

The necessity for the Church in the world endures through all time, and, consequently, perpetual authority is given to the ministry as the office of reconciliation, "always, even unto the end of the world," yet this authority is not absolute, but circumscribed and fixed, for the minister, though the ambassador of God, is such only in the Word and Sacraments, in accordance with which it is his duty to exercise his office; whenever he administers, contrary to the Word he is no longer the ambassador of God therein, and all are absolved from hearkening to his false and unscriptural teachings. Aug. Con. Art. 28. Sym. Books, p. 135.

The call to the holy office of the ministry is twofold; the call to the office in general, and the call to particular administrations in the office. In the general call to the office the rule of order in the Holy Scriptures is, that the office descends ordinarily from those who already hold, to those who desire it and upon careful scrutiny are found to possess the proper qualifications. It is not claimed here that ministerial succession, as we hold it, is one of special prerogative, i. e., that ministers have power to confer the office upon whom they desire and to withhold it from those upon whom they do not desire to confer it; neither that there is any special grace in ministerial ordination by succession. This succession is merely one of order in the Church established under the authority of Christ by the Holy Apostles, and in like manner to be perpetuated; and ordination is nothing more than publicly authorizing those who are found capable to teach and preach, in accordance with the clear Word of God. Hence also, should necessity arise, the congregation might authorize a minister for themselves leaving his authorization by or-

dination to follow whenever opportunity presents. Smal. Art. 10, and Appendix "Of the Power and Jurisdiction of Bishops." This power, however, the congregation has only by way of exception as in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism in extreme cases by a lay-member of the Church.

To particular pastorates the congregation has the right to call, whilst to offices of a general nature under the general ministry the Church, in her representative capacity, gives the call to special ministrations. The former part of this proposition, as we have seen, grows out of the relations which the congregation sustains to the Church in general, and which pastor and congregation sustain to each other. All the rights and immunities of the Church in general, the congregation has for itself in particular; the pastor, too, is not Lord over God's heritage, he is only the helper of their joy. The Church, through the ministry, examines and sets apart those who possess the necessary requirements, for the holy office in general, and for their own special requirements the congregations, being the best judges, are empowered by the Scriptures, to give the call.

The ministerial office is nevertheless totally disconnected with the spiritual priesthood, though by virtue of his office the minister becomes also the representative of the congregation in the public worship. The Priesthood of believers is the privilege of every believer, by which are all enabled to have free access to God in prayer, praise and thanksgiving without human mediation, alone through Christ, the only and everlasting Mediator between man and God. The office of the ministry is that of teaching and administering the Word of God, and is the office through which God deals graciously, according to his promises in Christ, with man; its exercise is confined to those specially set apart thereto. A. Conf. Art. 14.

We had intended to further exemplify our positions from the writings of Luther; but the great length, to which our article has already extended, will fully excuse us from doing so now. If we should have occasion to resume this subject, we are prepared to show that our positions are not only scriptural but in accordance with the almost universal practice of the Lutheran Church. For the present then, we dismiss the whole subject, praying for the blessing of God upon our feeble efforts to secure and promote the truth and power of the Holy Office, which He is pleased to own and bless in the salvation of immortal souls.

ARTICLE II.

THE SHEKINAH.

By Rev. T. T. Titus, A. M., Cabinet, Pa.

THE term *Shekinah* is an untranslated Hebrew word. It is not found in the Bible, but it is of frequent occurrence in the writings of the Jewish Rabbis. Targumists especially employ it with remarkable frequency. It is derived from the verb *שָׁכַן* *Shakan*, *to dwell*, *to inhabit*, applied usually to the nomadic method of dwelling in tents or tabernacles. The derivative *שְׁקִינָה* *Shekinah*, therefore, means primarily *habitation*. Buxtorf adds, that it is "spoken more particularly of the Divine presence, glory and majesty, or the Divinity itself when it is said to be present to men, or to converse with them, or to vouchsafe to them its sensible and gracious aid." He remarks further, "that it is commonly explained by the Rabbinical writers of the *Divine glory or majesty in its external manifestation* as something dwelling among men." In this sense it is used in the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos and Jonathan in the following among numerous other passages: Ps. 74: 2. "Remember thy congregation which thou hast purchased of old; this Mount Zion wherein thou hast dwelt." Chaldee, "Wherein thou hast made thy *Shekinah* to dwell." Numb. 11: 20, "Ye have despised the Lord which is among you." Chaldee, "Ye have despised the Word of the Lord whose *Shekinah* dwelleth among you." Hag. 1: 8, Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house, and I will take pleasure in it, and will be *glorified*, saith the Lord." Chaldee, "And I will make my *Shekinah* to dwell there in *glory*." Prof. Bush says, "it would be easy to multiply passages to the same effect *ad libitum*," and adds, that it is "the current phraseology of the Chaldee Paraphrases wherever in our version, we meet with any intimation of a visible display of the Divine glory."^{*}

The signification of the term is thus shown to be the glorious minifestation of the Divine Presence through the medium of some outward, visible symbol. It becomes, therefore, a term of momentous interest and attracts to it our most fervent attention. It shall be the aim of this article to trace

* Bush on the Shekinah, appended to Notes on Exodus, Vol. 1.

in the Divine Word the path of the sacred and mysterious symbol of God's presence, to which this term is applicable, as it sweeps through the past dispensation and shines forth in the person of Him who was the brightness of his Father's glory and the crowning manifestation of God to man. In attempting such a task, the writer is aware of its nature as verging on the incomprehensible, and tempting to undue speculation; yet he hopes the interest felt in the subject, and prompting this attempt, is mingled with a reverence for divine things, and a desire to promote the glory of God, sufficient to keep him within the strict limits of reason and scripture, and stimulate him to make a practical use of the result obtained.

I. As a starting point in our investigations we remark, that,

The first appearance of the Shekinah, was in the Burning Bush at Mt. Horeb.

If we examine the earlier history of the race, as given in the Sacred Record, we will find no divine manifestation corresponding to the definition of the Shekinah given above, till the time of Moses. God did, indeed, make known his will in the primitive and patriarchal ages, but it was not through the Shekinah. *How* he held communication with un fallen Adam, is not stated. No doubt peculiar and glorious manifestations of Deity were vouchsafed to him, but we have no reliable information on the subject. The first communication made after the fall was contained in the words uttered by the "voice of the Son of God walking in the Garden in the cool of the day." (Gen. 3: 8.) This does not mean, as the English translation seems to warrant, that God himself walked in the Garden in some visible form. The Hebrew participle translated *walking* *תְּהַלֵּךְ* agrees with *voice*, and the whole sentence contains a lively description of utterances increasing in loudness, and moving as things of life, through the bowers and avenues of Eden. There is nothing to justify the assumption of any Divine apparition on the occasion, much less of the Shekinah. Our first parents, no doubt, "heard only the voice and saw no man."

In reference to subsequent communications to Adam, Cain, Noah and others, it is not mentioned how they were made, and conjecture is useless. It is merely stated, "God said," "the Lord spake," without any intimation of a visible appearance of any kind. Sometimes, perhaps, these communications were made "in visions of the night, when deep

sleep falleth on men," as we learn from Job, 4: 13, 33: 15. The call of Abraham and the first covenant made with him, probably occurred in this manner, without any visible representative of Jehovah, as we gather from Gen. 15: 1, where it is said "the word of the Lord came unto Abraham *in a vision.*" The sublime apparition seen by the Temanite, (Job 4th ch.) partook more of the nature of a visible manifestation of Jehovah, but as we are distinctly told that this appeared "in thoughts from the visions of the night," it cannot be claimed among the manifestations we are discussing, since these are made to the waking senses. Sometimes, however, God condescended to appear in the earlier ages, in a visible form, but not that of the Shekinah.

In a later period of Abraham's life, we read of such a manifestation of Jehovah. Gen. 17: 1, it is said, "the Lord appeared to Abraham and said unto him, I am the Almighty God," "Abram" we are told, v. 3, "fell on his face," evidently before some visible personage, "and God talked with him, saying, Behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." And in v. 22, it is stated that "*he left off talking with him, and God went up from Abraham.*" That God appeared in some visible form, here to Abraham, can scarcely be doubted, but in what form we are not informed. In the 18th chapter, however, it is declared that God appeared in *human form*. Three *men* appeared before his tent door, whom he invited in and entertained. When they left he accompanied them for some distance, and in their conversation by the way, Abraham found that one of them was the *LORD*. The same Divine manifestation is mentioned in the succeeding chapter under the appellation "Angel of the Lord," and sometimes simply "the Lord." This was the case of the angels, (termed also men), who came to Lot in Sodom, (Gen. 19th chap.) there being intimations of more than angelic nature in them. So also in reference to the man who wrestled all night with Jacob in a subsequent age. He was evidently God incarnate, for Jacob exclaimed, after he had left him, "I have seen the Lord face to face." Gen. 32: 30. Now the question arises whether these manifestations of God, in visible form, are not entitled to a place among the appearances of the Shekinah. We think not, for the following among other reasons: 1. There was no outward display of Glory which seems to be essential to the Shekinah. Prof. Bush says, "the terms "Glory" and "Shekinah" are recognized by the Targumists as convertible

terms;" hence as there was no unusual splendor accompanying the appearances to Abraham, Lot and Jacob, we cannot consider them manifestations of the Shekinah as the Jewish writers understood that term. 2. Again, there was evident concealment of Divinity in the cases alluded to, except it be in that mentioned in Gen. 17: 1, where nothing is said about the form of the manifestation, and hence nothing can be proved by it. In the other instances, as the three men at Abraham's tent door, the angels in Lot's house, and the wrestler with Jacob, the human appearance completely eclipsed the divine, and it was only inferentially that the parties themselves discovered that Deity was near them. This is not the case with the Shekinah. It always claims to be a Divine manifestation and is so declared at the outset. Thus in the case of our Adorable Redeemer who was the Shekinah embodied in human form, there was no concealment of his true nature. He claimed Divinity and manifested it on all proper occasions.

Hence we conclude that the incarnations of the patriarchal age, were, though true incarnations of Divinity, undoubtedly inferior to the great incarnation of the Christian era. They were "God in the flesh," but less manifest, more closely veiled by human coverings, and remaining but a brief period in such connection, to accomplish specific purposes, and prepare the minds of men for fuller manifestations of the Godhead.

We assume, therefore, that no traces of the Shekinah are found in the history of the patriarchal age, or at any period prior to the time of Moses, when God appeared in a Flame of Fire at the foot of Horeb. The age of dreams and visions and temporary appearances of Deity in human form, had passed. Another dispensation was about to begin, the period of more permanent and higher revelations of God to man, and it was meet that it should be introduced by a more glorious visible manifestation of Divinity.

Moses was a shepherd in the land of Midian. He had been expelled from Egypt forty years before, on account of a premature effort he had made to deliver his Hebrew brethren from the cruel bondage they were there suffering. He came as a stranger to the house of Jethro, the priest of Midian, who received him kindly, and gave him his daughter, Zipporah, to wife. In the employment of his father-in-law he had passed year after year quietly and pleasantly, leading his employer's flocks from place to place. As he watched

them by day and by night, he no doubt often communed with his own heart, and with the God of his fathers through the works of nature. He saw the manifestations of God's glory and power in the far off stars that glittered in the nocturnal canopy overarching the plains of Midian. He saw that glory manifested also in the majestic peaks of Horeb, towering grandly toward heaven, from behind which the moon and stars rose slowly up night after night, and the beauteous morn sent forth its first rays, day after day. From sky and mountain, sun, moon and star, a voice was ever speaking to him of the Great Unseen Creator of all things, and awaking within him holy and solemn emotions, devout aspirations and high resolves. The Lord was thus preparing him for the great work which he was to accomplish for his people, for forty years service in leading a better flock than Jethro's sheep and goats, through this same wilderness, and forty days higher communion with him on one of those same rocky peaks of Horeb.

And now the time had come when the afflictions of Israel had reached their climax. "The Lord heard their groaning, remembered his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had respect unto their posterity." Ex. 2: 23, 24, 25. Moses is now to be taught more directly than by midnight stars and towering mountain cliffs. A new and more glorious manifestation of God than nature affords, is to be made to him. As he led his flocks around to the far side of the desert at the foot of lofty Horeb, behold, "The angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a burning bush; and he looked and behold the bush burned with fire and the bush was not consumed." Ex. 3: 2. He turned aside to inspect this novel and startling phenomenon more closely, when a voice called to him "out of the midst of the bush," a voice of majesty and power, saying, "Moses! Moses!" The trembling shepherd replied, "here am I." The sublime voice responded, "Draw not nigh hither, put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground!" As Moses, astonished and awe stricken, complied with the solemn injunction, the voice once more addressed him, saying, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob." The mystery was now solved only to become more sublime and solemn. Moses found himself standing in the immediate presence, the very audience chamber of Jehovah, the Great I AM. With deep abasement and reverence,

therefore, he hid his face and dared not look up, lest a sight of the glory of the Lord would overwhelm him.

Here, then, we have the first appearance of the Shekinah, or the Glorious Manifestation of God's presence which moved majestically through the whole Mosaic dispensation, as an angel of the Lord, a messenger from heaven to guide, cheer, instruct and defend. That this was the real Shekinah will scarcely be doubted. It has all the characteristics usually attributed by Jewish writers to the Shekinah. It was a glowing, burning symbol by which God indicated his immediate presence. Through it God spoke to Moses and gave important directions concerning his people in Egypt, commissioning him to deliver them out of bondage, and promising his presence and assistance. Though the phenomenon remained visible, probably but a short time, yet it re-appeared soon after the Pillar of Cloud and Fire in a more permanent form. Besides, permanency is not an essential characteristic of the Shekinah, since the Targums apply the term to transient manifestations of God's presence when accompanied with visible glory. Indeed, if the appearance at the Burning Bush was not the true Shekinah, it would be difficult to characterize that wonderful symbol at all. Hence assuming it as admitted that we have here the real Shekinah of God, we will indulge a few comments on it before proceeding to its next appearance. Let us consider,

1. *The Being who here manifested himself.*

This was none other than God.

In that flame of fire was specially present the Glorious Being who called himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and who informed Moses that he had *come down to deliver* his people from their Egyptian bondage. In it was the Being who had *seen* their oppression and *heard* their cry. (see Ex. 3: 7-9.) And in it was He who styled himself by that awful and eternal name, *I AM THAT I AM!* (see v. 14.) Here then we have proof that no angel of light, no created Being, no deputy from heaven, but the uncreated and eternal God dwelt, in some mysterious manner, in that flaming bush. He was Omniscient, for he could see and hear Israel's bondage and cry; he was Omnipotent, for he had come to deliver his people from earth's greatest king; and he was Self-Existent and Eternal, for the title, *I am that I am*, could be used in reference to no other Being.

If the question arise, as it often has, which Person of the Trinity was thus present? we answer this is one of the in-

scrutable mysteries that hang around the whole subject of the Shekinah, which tempts speculation, but about which speculation would be both hazardous and unprofitable.

It is an opinion adopted by many and supported by numerous considerations, that it was God the Son who thus communicated with Moses. We see nothing to forbid such a supposition, and will adduce much to favor it in our subsequent remarks. Yet it must be borne in mind that the distinction between the persons of the Trinity, was for wise reasons, not clearly revealed in the Old Testament ages. It is only when we read the Old Testament in the light of the New and find God the Son the great Revealer and Communicator between Deity and humanity, that we conclude it was He who was present in the Shekinah and other Divine manifestations of former dispensations. Yet it must ever be remembered that the manifestation loses none of its glory and majesty by this supposition, that it still is a Divine appearance, still God tabernacling with men. The ideas of the Son gathered from reading his life in the Gospels, must be dismissed, and we must conceive of him in his primeval equality with the Father, wearing the glory which he had before the world was, and taking upon himself in the counsels of the Eternal Trinity, the office of making known Deity to man.

2. The next point noticeable in this Divine manifestation, is *the element through which God chose to manifest himself.* This was a Flame of Fire. It is useless to discuss the question whether this was material fire or not; or if it was, how it was fed, since the bush remained unconsumed. It is sufficient to assert that it was a miraculous appearance, that the Eternal God saw fit, in revealing himself to man, to draw around him the drapery of a brilliant Flame, and conceal the brighter effulgence of his essential glory under this burning symbol. Fire and flame seem, on other occasions, also, to be used by God as symbols of his Being and perfections. It may be profitable to refer to a few passages illustrative of this point. In Ezekiel's "Visions of God" which he saw "by the river Chebar," (Ez. 1: 1,) it is said, "I looked and behold a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof, as the color of amber, out of the midst of the fire." Ez. 1: 4. The description of the Son of God in Dan. 9: 10, is familiar to every Bible reader.

"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the

fiery flames, and his wheels *as burning fire*. *A fiery stream* issued and came forth from him." Ps. 97: 3. "*A fire goeth before him and burneth up his enemies round about*." Is. 10: 17, "And the light of Israel shall be for a *fire* and his Holy One for a *flame*, and it shall *burn and devour* his thorns and briers in one day." Deut. 9: 3. "The Lord thy God is he which goeth before thee *as a consuming fire*." 32: 22. "For a *fire is kindled* in mine anger and shall *burn unto the lowest hell*." In the manifestation of God the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the visible symbol was "*tongues of fire*," and in Heb. 12: 29, the Apostle declares "*Our God is a consuming fire*." From these and other passages we learn that fire was considered and used by the sacred writers as a standing symbol of Deity. Especially was this the case under the Mosaic dispensation, the age of the law, burning with holiness and justice, as if God would impress mankind with the glory of his Being and Perfections, as displayed through the sterner attributes of Purity, Righteousness and Truth, ere he displayed the gentler glory which beams from his Love and Mercy. And what better symbol could be found in nature to set forth God as a holy and righteous Being, the source of light and life to all the moral universe, than fire and flame? As the flame sheds around it radiance and warmth, so does God illuminate and vivify all minds and all worlds. He is the resplendent sun of the universe whence emanates the moral light, the knowledge and wisdom "which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." What does man know of himself, of creation, of the future, that is worth knowing, which God has not communicated? How dark is that heart which has no God to illuminate it? How gloomy above all things, is the Atheist's creed and the Atheist's life. God believed, adored, loved and obeyed; God sought for in nature and revelation; God revealed by the spirit of the inner consciousness of the soul, is the light and warmth of the moral, the spiritual world.

Equally appropriate is fire as a symbol of God's Purity and Holiness. Flame is pure and purifying. There is no admixture of foreign matter in it. The union of two elements of nature gives rise to the lambent blaze, ethereal and undefinable in its character, yet spotless and immaculate to behold. Fit emblem thus of Him who is infinitely pure and immaculate, the very brightness of whose holiness consumes before it all that is evil, and renders him too glorious for the eyes

of sinful mortals to gaze upon. No spot or blemish, defect or taint, dares cast its shadow on the glittering surface of his purity. Appropriately, therefore, does he chose the refulgent flame as his drapery when he reveals himself to men, teaching them that he is glorious in holiness, and will be sanctified in the eyes of all nations.

But chiefly does the flame symbolize the wrath of God and his fierce judgments against transgression. A God of infinite justice and holiness must be a God, taking vengeance upon all iniquity. After man's fall and expulsion from Eden, Cherubim and a flaming sword were stationed to guard the way to the tree of life. Here the flame followed transgression, and ever since, God has shown himself a consuming fire to his foes.* Our age of grace and mercy to sinners results from the interposition of Christ, who quenched the flaming sword of Divine vengeance in his own blood on Calvary. Yet to all the finally impenitent, he will, in the end, reveal himself in a "flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." How significant, then, was this initiation at Horeb of the age of the law, which condemns the transgressor! The world was to be tutored for fifteen hundred years to fear a sin-avenging God, under the burning eye of the Shekinah. God had come down to tabernacle with men in the glorious symbol of his holiness and wrath, to fit them for the tabernacling of the Son in human flesh. The oppressor of his people, proud and hardened Pharaoh, was first to feel the power of his vindictive justice, and stand for all time as a monument of his judicial vengeance. This great design of his appearance he makes known to Moses as he stood in trembling awe before the glowing manifestation of Deity. The Lord assures the heart of the shepherd of Midian, by commissioning him to bear a conspicuous part in the grand drama about to be enacted, and thus the age of the Shekinah began with the commencement of the Mosaic dispensation.

3. But we dare not omit a glance at an humbler figure in this glorious appearance to Moses, *the Bush itself*. And

* "The flaming sword which turned every way is, like the corresponding appearances of fire in 15: 17. Ex. 3: 2, 3; 13: 21, and in Ez. 1: 4, 13, 27, a symbol of the holiness of God, as well in its consuming as in its purifying aspect; in the present instance, it assumes in its expression of displeasure, judicially, a primitive and repellent character." Kurtz Sac. Hist. p. 46.

what thoughts cluster around that Bush ! An unsightly bramble, perhaps, growing on the rocky slopes at the foot of the towering Horeb, was chosen as the material object upon which the divine symbol rested. Honored bush of the desert ! honored above thy towering relatives of plain and forest ! No Cedar of Lebanon ever wore such a crown of glory as thou ! No waving palm in all the Orient was ever clothed in such drapery as enveloped thee ! Divinity has touched thee and thou art ablaze with ineffable effulgence.

What lessons have we here taught us ? God's presence manifested will consecrate the humblest place, the most insignificant object. It is this that makes the true Bethels of earth, transforms the most unpretending edifice into a more glorious temple of God, than gorgeous cathedrals with emblazoned altars, and gilded domes. This, too, makes men the oracles of God. If God's spirit dwell in the heart and the tongue is touched with a live coal from off the altar above, the minister, however uncomely in speech and appearance to worldly eyes, though as uninviting as the bramble bush at Horeb, becomes the Shekinah of God, all aglow with the light and beauty of Divine truth ! And finally, in this union of the flaming symbol of Divinity with an ungainly bush, we have an impressive type of that glorious union of the Divine and human natures in Christ. How like the thorny bramble was our nature when Christ came to inhabit it and illuminate it with the glory of the Shekinah. Worthless, fruitless, thistle-like was our barren, stunted race; yet the Son of God became a member of it, united Divinity to it. "Verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." (Heb. 6: 16.) How like the flame on Horeb which passed by the stately cedar and palm, and alighted upon the worthless bramble !* And what an honor is thus conferred upon human nature, an honor which angels never enjoyed, the honor of a union with the Divine, the In-

* "And what symbol did our Lord select in which to embody his Deity ? Did he choose some tall cedar of Lebanon, or some majestic oak of the forest ? Nay ; but a *Bush*, the most mean and insignificant, the most lowly and unsightly of trees was to enshrine the Godhead of him whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain. And what is the truth it conveys ? Oh, most glorious and precious ! It points to the incarnate glory of the Son of God, the lowliness and meanness of his nature. He did not embody his Godhead in some tall Archangel or glowing Seraph, but he lowered himself to our mean and degraded nature, selected our fallen, suffering, sorrowing, tempted humanity, and took it into union with Deity." *Winslow on the Glory of the Redeemer*, pp. 87-88.

finite, the Eternal! Truly great, glorious and instructive are all the mysteries of Godliness.

But it is time to return and trace the footsteps of the Shekinah in its subsequent manifestations. This we will do without dwelling as minutely on each succeeding appearance as we have done on this first one, since much that we have already said will apply to all the manifestations of this mysterious symbol.

II. *The Pillar of Cloud and Fire, by which the Israelites were led from Egypt to Canaan, is the next manifestation of the Divine Shekinah.*

Moses and Aaron after many unsuccessful efforts, and the performance of a series of stupendous miracles, through the mighty power of God, obtained permission from the proud, false-hearted king of Egypt, for Israel to depart out of his dominions. Having made all the necessary preparations as directed by Jehovah, and eaten the Paschal Lamb in the divinely prescribed manner, the people of God assembled at Rameses in a vast company, numbering more than two millions of souls, and took up their line of march toward the Red Sea. They encamped first at Succoth and journeyed thence to Etham in the edge of the wilderness. And now turning, they encamp before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, to the eye of a spectator who knew the geography of the land, the movements of the Israelites must have been singular and inexplicable. They followed not the usual caravan route, but bent their footsteps towards the unbridged and unfordable bay that separated Egypt from the desert of Arabia-Petraea. To all human appearances they were inextricably "entangling themselves in the land." Like some retreating army whose leaders were slain in battle or incompetent to direct judiciously, they seemed to be rushing to certain destruction, marching they know not whither, and by their ignorance rendering themselves an easy prey to the pursuing host of Pharaoh. But the reverse of all this is true. They are making no random marches. They are not without a competent leader. They are not to become a prey to the Egyptians. See yon column of cloud, towering gracefully above the moving multitude, its broad base casting a refreshing shade upon them, as they tread the burning sand. Gently it moves onward making out the way in which the pilgrim host is to go. All eyes are upon it, for they have instinctively learned its mission. They recognize it as their divinely appointed guide, and follow confidently its leadings. "But what

shall we do when night comes on and we cannot see our aerial conductor," they ask sadly of each other. Watch the result and see how their anxiety is allayed. The evening closes around the camp over against Baal-zephon, on the gloomy borders of the wilderness and the sea. The sun sinks behind the hills that separate them from the plains of the Nile, and twilight shadows steal up from the gulf of Suez. But see the cloudy pillar as daylight departs. At first a ruddy glow gleams from its surface, as if the rays of the setting sun still lingered upon it. But it fades not away with the gathering shades. It grows brighter with the increasing darkness, till at last, as the stars take their places in the heavens, and "the moon lights up her watch fires" in the distant clouds, their rays pale before the splendor of the glowing column, as it becomes a "pillar of fire" in the nocturnal firmament! And all night long that brilliant sentinel hangs watching over the slumbering camp, and shedding its mellow radiance down upon the reposing Hebrews. It was the Divine SHEKINAH, robed in a mantle of cloud, that thus hovered over the people of God. And from that memorable hour when it first appeared as a "pillar of cloud by day to lead them, and a pillar of fire by night to give them light," it continued to go before them in all their pilgrimage, till they were safe in the land of promise. It was not taken away from before the people by day or night during the forty years of their subsequent wanderings, murmurings and sins in the desert. The Lord was in it to cheer, guide protect and punish; and faithful to his promise. "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give the rest," Ex. 33: 14, he forsook not his people in all their vicissitudes.*

In regard to the nature of this wonderful symbol of God's presence, but little is accurately known. It appears to have been a concentrated glowing brightness, a preternatural splendor, enfolded by a dark cloud, except on extraordinary occasions, as at the giving of the law on Sinai, and when Nadab and Abihu offered strange fire upon the altar of God. On these occasions the enveloping cloud seems to have parted

* The pillar of cloud and of fire was a symbol, sign and pledge of the immediate presence of Jehovah among his people. The pillar of fire, the image of the holiness of God, is enclosed and veiled by a pillar of a cloud (or smoke), as the feeble eye of sinful man is not capable of enduring the sight of the unveiled glory of the Lord. But the brightness of the divine fire is seen through the cloud which enveloped it; hence the pillar appeared by day as a pillar of vapor, and by night as a pillar of fire. *Kurtz Sac. Hist.* p. 111.

and suffered the inwrapped glory to flash out and burn with such overwhelming brilliancy as to spread terror and death around. The brightness of the pillar at night was probably caused by the shining through of this internal splendor in a subdued radiance, illuminating and cheering, without terrifying and consuming. According to this view we here have the flaming Shekinah that appeared in the bush on Horeb with which Divinity was united in a mysterious manner, and through which God manifested his special presence, contained about by day with a cloudy veil, and displaying itself through its covering in a softened splendor by night, and ever and anon by some more overpowering manifestation, giving proof of its intimate relation to Jehovah. That any such a phenomenon can be accounted for by the known laws of electricity, meteorology or magnetism, is, of course, preposterous, and we must consider it a continuous miracle of forty years duration, proved beyond all doubt by two millions of witnessses.

Whatever may have been the precise nature of the cloudy envelop, or of the internal splendor, it is very certain that God dwelt and journeyed before Israel in this mysterious pillar. The terms that are applied to it preclude all doubt on this point. In Ex. 14 : 19, it is said, "And the Angel of God which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them, and the pillar of cloud went from before their face and stood behind them." Here we have what is called the "Angel of God" in one clause, termed the "Pillar of Cloud," in another. Now the same term "Angel of the Lord," is mentioned in the description of the burning bush, as having appeared unto Moses "in a flame of fire out of the midst of the bush." But the Being who there appeared declared himself to be the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Great I AM. Hence, we infer that the Angel of the Lord, or the messenger—the sent of God, means the same communicating person of the Godhead here in the pillar of cloud and fire. If we trace the use of the phrase "Angel of God," this view will become further confirmed. Ex. 23 : 20, 23, "Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way and to bring thee into the place I have prepared. Beware of him and obey his voice, and do all that *I* speak; then *I* will be an enemy unto thine enemies and an adversary unto thine adversaries." (See whole passage.) This Angel, was, beyond doubt, the visible Shekinah in the pillar of cloud, and it will be perceived that God in the above passage, iden-

tifies himself with this personage. Hence, we conclude this personage to be Divine. Again, the same personage is alluded in Is. 63 : 9, "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the Angel of his presence saved them ; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them ; and he bare them and carried them all the days of old." Here the prophet is speaking of God's goodness to Israel, and again God and the Angel of God are used interchangeably, acts being ascribed to the latter, as in the last quotation from Exodus, which can be predicted of no created being.

Once more the same "Angel" is alluded to undoubtedly, in Malachi, 3 : 1, where it is said, "Behold I will send my messenger, (my Angel, the same Hebrew word *מֶלֶךְ* *malak*, which is used in Ex. and Is.,) and he shall prepare the way before me ; and the *Lord* whom ye seek will suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger, (i. e., Angel) of the covenant, whom ye delight in ; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." Here, again, it is evident that "the *Lord*" and "the Angel of the Covenant" are identical. But the *Lord* here is conceded by all to mean Christ; it is a Messianic prophecy, fulfilled when Jesus suddenly entered the temple at Jerusalem and purified it. Hence, we arrive at the highly important conclusion that the Angel of God, or of the Covenant, is none other than Christ Jesus, our Divine and Adorable Redeemer. The extensive field of thought thus opened to our view we have not time to explore now. We are concerned to prove God present in the Pillar of Cloud and Fire, and have proved that God, even *God the Son*, was there manifested, not in fleshly garments, but in the glorious Shekinah of the Old Testament.

Another proof of Divinity dwelling in the Pillar, we find in the protection it afforded them against their enemies. When Pharaoh pursued and overtook the Israelites by the Red Sea, this column transferred its position from the front to the rear of their camp, and stationed itself between them and the Egyptians. But to the latter it proved itself no symbol of glory, but "was a cloud and darkness unto them, whilst it gave light by night to the Israelites," thus preventing a night attack from Pharaoh, and "one came not near the other all night," Ex. 14 : 19-20. But this was not all. A higher display of God's power was to take place. Moses stretched out his hand over the sea and the *Lord* caused the sea to "go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided." The

Children of Israel entered the passage thus opened to them by omnipotent power, and passed safely through between the watery walls. The Egyptians pursued and likewise entered the passage. And now mark their discomfiture, "And it came to pass in the morning watch *the Lord* looked unto the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the hosts of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, that they drove them heavily; so that the Egyptians said, 'Let us flee from the face of Israel; for *the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians.*'" Here we have further proof that God dwelt in that wondrous column, since it is declared that the Lord looked out of it and exerted his power through it to overthrow Pharaoh's host. His glory, no doubt, broke through the cloudy covering and flashed out in the fierceness of his wrath upon the enemies of his people; thus fulfilling the inspired declarations, "Clouds and darkness are around about him, but righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne," "A fire goeth before him and burneth up his enemies round about." Ps. 97: 2, 3. God dwelt in the pillar of cloud and fire to protect his people and blast their enemies, as well as to cheer them with his presence, and guide them in all the ways they should go. Hence the Israelites were taught to associate Divine power, authority, majesty and omniscience with the external symbol which accompanied them. In the language of another, "To all practical purposes it was to them the Angel Jehovah, the God of their nation, and they were to look up to that sublime and awful column as a visible embodiment of their covenant God, as an ever present witness, and feel as if a thousand eyes were peering out of the midst of it upon them, from which, even their slightest word or deed could not be hidden."^{*} It became thus a kind of watch tower of the Almighty, an aerial Mizpeh or place of espial, where Jehovah was enthroned in a robe of cloud and fire as an omnipotent friend and helper, and an omniscient judge.

Once more we observe that this cloudy Pillar enclosing the Divine Shekinah, was the oracle, or mouth-piece of God, and thus proved itself to be the residence of Deity. "They called upon the Lord and he answered them. He spake unto them in the cloudy pillar." Ps. 99: 6, 7. There can be no doubt that the overpowering manifestation of God's presence on Sinai, "when it was altogether on a smoke, because

* Bush on the Pillar of Cloud.

the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace," was an unusual display of the Shekinah as it rested for a time upon the mountain. In Ex. 24: 15, 16, 17, we are told that "Moses went up into the Mount and a cloud covered the Mount. And the glory of the Lord (the very designation of the Shekinah) abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days. And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the Mount, in the eyes of the children of Israel. And Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and was in the Mount forty days and forty nights." What was the nature of the intercourse Moses held with God in the midst of that glory and that cloud? no mortal knows. We do know, however, that when he came down his face shone so brightly by communion with Jehovah, that he was obliged to veil it from the gaze of the people. And we know further, that God communicated to him on that occasion and on former occasions, the moral and ceremonial laws, and instructed him in all that pertained to his high office as law-giver of God's chosen people. It was, therefore, through the Shekinah on Sinai, manifested in more than its wonted splendor, that the law was given. Through it God spoke at first to all the Israelites who were so overpowered with the terrific display of Divine glory that they removed and stood afar off, and besought Moses to act as mediator between them and God, lest they should die if God spoke with them. It was, therefore, the Oracle of Jehovah on Sinai, as it had been his oracle in the bush at Horeb.

But a most remarkable passage on this point is found in Ex. 33 : 2, 10, 11. After Moses had descended and constructed the Tabernacle and pitched it according to Divine directions, it is stated, that "It came to pass as Moses entered into the Tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended (from Sinai where it had rested,) and stood at the door of the tabernacle and talked with Moses." The common version has "*the Lord talked, etc.*" the translators supplying the word "Lord," because they supposed the pillar could not talk. But the version given ascribes a personality to the symbol which is entirely in accordance with other descriptions of its acts. We are told, further, in the same connection, "And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle door; and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man in his tent door. And the Lord spake unto Moses face to

face, as a man speaketh unto his friend." (See altogether the last six verses of that chapter.) How face to face, as no man hath seen God at any time. Evidently "face to face" with the glowing symbol—God's immediate Shekinah, in which Deity dwelt and through which he communicated for many ages with his people. There is reason to suppose that this symbol was the channel of communication between God and the Israelites during all their wanderings, and that where "the Lord" and "the presence of God," and similar expressions are used they refer to the Shekinah which went with them.

III. This view of the Shekinah as the oracle of God, is confirmed and enlarged by following it a step further in its history, and viewing it as *established in the Tabernacle and Temple "above the Mercy seat and between the Cherubim."*

The Tabernacle was erected in the wilderness, and in it the descendants of Israel worshipped till the Temple at Jerusalem was built by Solomon, and took the place of the Tabernacle. The sacred utensils were all then transferred from the latter to the former, and among them was the Ark of the testimony, the Mercy seat and the Cherubim. (See 1 Kings, 8 : 6.) Thenceforward the worship of God was performed in the Temple instead of the Tabernacle, and God communicated with the people in the former, as he had before done in the latter.

It seems that during the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness, the pillar of cloud and fire rested at times on the Mercy seat, and there became God's oracle to Moses as it did at the door of the Tabernacle in the account given above. This we gather from the passage in Ex. 25 : 22, where God directs Moses to "put the Mercy seat above upon the Ark" and to construct Cherubim that would cover the Mercy seat with their outstretched wings. "And there I will meet with thee and commune with thee from above the Mercy seat, from between the two Cherubim which are upon the Ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." This promise to commune with Moses was no doubt fulfilled by the Shekinah in the pillar entering the tabernacle and resting in the designated place. But this was not its permanent location, as we are led to believe from various passages, that the cloudy pillar still performed its office as guide to the Israelites, resting on the Tabernacle whilst they were encamped, and until they arrived in the land of promise. When it ceased to go

before them is not known, nor is it material to know. When it did, however, it became a permanent oracle between the Cherubim over the Mercy seat. No longer a literal guide it became a spiritual one. Whilst in the desert God had spoken through it, gave his law to Moses by it as a mouth piece, yet he continued it as Israel's divine conductor also by day and night, till their wanderings ceased, and they entered upon their promised inheritance. It then became Jehovah's oracle to counsel, instruct and reprove his people, and lead them to a better, nobler Canaan above. Thus it continued in the Tabernacle and Temple till the sins of God's people caused it to depart forever, and they were left for three hundred years without Shekinah or prophet, Urim and Thummim. At length God again visited his people, again the Shekinah appeared in a more tangible form than ever before, but Israel's seed recognized it not, and did unto it whatsoever they listed.

In reference to the nature of the Divine manifestation over the Mercy seat in the Tabernacle and Temple, we know little or nothing. But little is recorded concerning it. It was one of the profound mysteries of the Jewish worship. None but the High Priests had access to the solemn precincts where Jehovah dwelt between the Cherubim, and then only in a cloud of incense and with the blood of the offering. A curtain, lifted but once a year, and then when no spectators were present, separated the "Holy of holies" from the "holy place." That curtain concealed the Shekinah from the vulgar gaze, and was only rent when the body of Jesus was rent upon the cross.

Jehovah, it seems, thus withdrew his visible symbol from the eyes of all but the anointed High Priest, the mediator of the Old Covenant, and enthroned himself in solemn majesty in the penetralia of his Temple on Mount Moriah, during the period of Israel's monarchies. From this secret chamber he sent forth his warning responses and his cheering promises. Whether the High Priest, like Moses, beheld the cloud of divine glory hovering above the Mercy seat when he entered these solemn precincts, we know not; it is probable he did, since there is no reason to suppose that the essence of the symbol was changed when it became permanent in the Temple. On extraordinary occasions it seems the Lord caused his presence over the Ark, both in the Tabernacle and Temple, to be seen and felt by the people. Thus, at the dedication of the Tabernacle, (Lev. 9: 24,) it is said,

"there came a fire out from before the Lord and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat; which when all the people saw they shouted and fell on their faces." In the same connection, (Lev. 10: 1, 2,) it is stated that Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, the High Priest, presumed to offer "strange fire before the Lord which he commanded them not, and there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord." Traces of the same judicial manifestations in connection with the Ark of God are found in 1 Sam, 6: 19, where the destruction of the men of Beth-shemesh for looking into the Ark of the Lord, is recorded, and in 2 Sam. 6: 6, 7, where it is declared "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah for his rashness" in taking hold of the Ark of God to steady it, "and there he died by the Ark of God." When the Temple afterwards was finished and the Ark and holy vessels placed in the holy of holies, we are told, (1 Kings, 8: 10, 11,) "And it came to pass when the priests were come out of the holy place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord." Again, on the same occasion, when Solomon had concluded the dedication prayers, it is said, (2 Chron. 7: 1, 2, 3,) "the fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and sacrifices, and the glory of the Lord filled the house. And the priests could not enter into the house of the Lord, because the glory of the Lord had filled the Lord's house. And when all the Children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped and praised the Lord, saying: For he is good; for his mercy endureth forever." Here was evidently the same divine Shekinah which had led Israel out of Egypt into the promised land, the same which had crowned Mount Sinai with its splendor, and baptized the Tabernacle in the wilderness with its glory. And it is not unreasonable to suppose that it dwelt during the subsequent periods of Jewish history, as a continual glowing oracle between the Cherubim, flashing out at times in wrathful flames upon the bold transgressor, or falling in more gracious manifestations upon the sacrifices, as a consuming fire to attest the special divine acceptance of the offering. To the Jewish mind, therefore, the most holy place was considered as God's awful throne, the place where and whence he manifested his special pres-

ence. Hence we hear the Psalmist exclaiming, Ps. 80: 1, "Thou that dwellest between the Cherubim, shine forth," and again, Ps. 99: 1, "The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble; he sitteth between the Cherubim, let the earth be moved. It was also considered as the place of communication between God and his people, and was called *דביר debir*, word, place, from *דבר dabar*, word, to which, as every scholar is aware, the Greek *λόγος*, word, corresponds, which is used by John in the commencement of his Gospel, as a title of the Son of God.* We thus arrive at an important inference concerning the Shekinah, viz.: that it was a manifestation of the same Divine Person and for the same purpose substantially, as the Incarnation of the Logos, or Word, under the New Testament economy, and thus we are led to the last aspect of our subject.

IV. *The Incarnate Son of God, the final manifestation of the Shekinah.*

The same being who spake to Moses on Horeb in the Burning Bush, and on Sinai in a cloud of glory, who manifested his presence in the pillar of cloud and pillar of fire, and guided Israel through all their wanderings in the wilderness, and who dwelt between the Cherubim in the Tabernacle and Temple as the Logos of the Old Testament economy, became, in the fullness of time, "flesh, and dwelt (*σαρκωσεν*—tabernacle, or *shekinized*, from the same root as Shekinah) among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begot-

* No one at all conversant with the Chaldee paraphrases can have failed to notice, that besides Shekinah; the title they very frequently give to the appearance of the Divine Being spoken of in the Hebrew records is *מִנְרָאָה memra da Yehovah*, which, as the Greek language prevailed and acquired a fixed predominance, was translated 'The Logos, or Word of the Lord.' The Shekinah, as we have seen, was a sensible medium of the manifestation of the Divine presence and the declaration of the Divine will. As an audible voice frequently accompanied its appearance, it came naturally to be called 'The Word of the Lord.' Hence it is said in the Targums, "The Word of the Lord" appeared to Jacob. Gen. 35: 9, met with the people without the camp, Ex. 19: 17, met Balaam. Numb. 23: 4, "shall fight for you," Deut. 1: 3, and is applied to God's visible presence in a multitude of other places. When John, therefore, uses "Logos" or Word as a title of Christ, was he not applying a Jewish name in accordance with the established Jewish *usus loquendi*? Does he not thus connect the Shekinah of the Old Testament with the Shekinah of the New, in a manner perfectly intelligible to Jewish ears, without borrowing the term (Logos) applied by the Platonicizing fathers in their tissue of Gnostic philosophy, to the personification of the Divine Wisdom or Reason? Condensed from *Bush on the Shekinah*, pp. 297-9.

ten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John 1: 14. He fulfilled all the offices of the Shekinah of the Old Testament besides some that were peculiar to himself.

1. *He manifested the Divine Presence and glory.* "In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," Col. 2: 9. "He was the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person," Heb. 1: 3. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he declares John 14: 9.

In the calm dignity and holy beauty of his person, in the sweet pathos and commanding power of his words, and in the miraculous nature of his works, he displayed the glory and majesty of the Godhead. Wherever he went, light and love were diffused around him. The moral grandeur of Divinity was in all he did and said. None could see him or hear him long without perceiving that he was a superior Being. He was "God manifest in the flesh," "seen of men" tabernacling, shekinizing in our sinful world, showing us perfect God and perfect man in one mysterious, glorious Being. Like the Shekinah of the Israelites, the Divine was veiled by the natural, the human. His humanity was the cloudy covering of his divinity, through which the real brightness and splendor of the latter only occasionally shone.

At his transfiguration on Tabor there was evidently such a shining through of the inwrapped glory, "when his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light;" "whiter than any fuller on earth could make it," Matt. 17: 2—Mark, 9: 3. Here was a flashing out of concealed divinity, such as occurred so often under the old economy in connection with the Shekinah, and termed thus "the Glory of God." Now indeed it was connected not with a cloudy pillar, but with a human form, and thus the mystery and glory were both enhanced. What was the precise nature of the temporary change or transformation wrought upon the body of Christ at this time, is, of course, a matter of conjecture, and is not material to our elucidation. If we consider it analogous to that which we conceive occurred in the cloudy pillar at evening, as above stated, it would coincide with the views expressed by others on this point. According to this view it would be, not a change of the essence or substance of the Savior's body, but a temporary glorification of it by the shining through of indwelling divinity. The human became, as it were, fused or completely permeated by the divine, the limits between matter and spirit were overleaped, and the disciples were favored with a glimpse of that

glory which the Son had with the Father before the world was, and which he now has, as he is seated in his glorified humanity at the right hand of the Father in heaven, and is worshipped by all the heavenly host, among whom are doubtlessly Peter, James and John, gazing enraptured on the permanent transfiguration of their Lord. Such a theory in reference to this wonderful display on Tabor, accords but with all the circumstances of the case. He had already displayed and proved his divinity by his works before thousands. It became important, in view of his approaching death and final glorification, that he should initiate a few of his followers into a still higher degree of the divine mystery of the incarnation. He accordingly selected the favored three—*ἰακώβοι τῶν ἀπόστολων*—the elect of the elect, and displayed the glory of his divinity in the manner described, thus giving them an anticipatory view of him whom they were to preach to Jew and Gentile, a risen and glorified Redeemer. In this manner were they prepared for the great work of establishing a new dispensation, as Moses was prepared for a similar work by a similar vision of Deity in the Bush at Horeb. They, like Moses, are overcome with the display, and fall on “their faces sore afraid,” trembling at their proximity to unveiled Deity. Subsequently however, we hear the bewildered but ecstatic Peter, exclaiming, “Lord, let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses and one for Elias.” Now this request of Peter is remarkable in this, that he thought immediately of a tabernacle. He remembered that it was in the Tabernacle that the Divine Shekinah, so radiant in glory, had heretofore manifested itself between the Cherubim, and hence he naturally connected in his excited imagination, the present glorious appearance of his Master with the bright symbol of divinity which hovered over the Mercy seat in the Tabernacle and Temple; as if he would say, “we have here the holy of holies, we have the two Cherubim, the glorified forms of Moses and Elias, and we have the divine Shekinah, but we have no Temple, no Tabernacle to contain them.”*

* “The disciples now saw that the tabernacle of God was indeed with men, they came unto the Holy of holies in the exercise of that high priesthood to which all believers are now introduced through Christ, for that veil which was to be rent forever on Calvary, was drawn aside by a gracious anticipation, and Moses and Elias, symbolizing, yea, actually exhibiting the same truth which the Cherubim showed in type, (viz: that the host of heaven “desire to look into these things,”) there with that true “Shepherd of Israel” who led Joseph like a flock, shining forth in his Father’s glory and his own, showed that the New Jerusalem

It is useless to follow in detail the history of Jesus and show the various times and manners in which he manifested the presence and glory of indwelling divinity. His whole ministry is but the radiant footsteps of the embodied, incarnate Shekinah, moving among men to accomplish the high and holy purposes of Deity in reference to our sinful race, and exhibiting as much of the divine perfections as mankind were able to receive.

2. *But Christ also was the channel of positive verbal communication between God and man, and in this discharged the office of the Shekinah of the Old Testament.*

Much might be said on this point, but the length of our essay admonishes us to confine our observations to a few particulars. One great aim in the Savior's ministry among men was to instruct, communicate, enlighten. He was the true light of the world, and all his discourses and teachings are radiant with heavenly wisdom. His words distilled like the dew of Hermon upon the thirsty hearer. He opened his mouth in parables, and the most ignorant could not fail to understand him. He discoursed of the deep things of God, and carried the most learned and profound to the limit of their comprehension, intimating the infinite extent that lay beyond. Whatever he discussed became transparent and enrapturing. A hallowed interest attached to all he said, and his enemies were forced to confess "Never man spake like this man."

The teachings of Christ when combined, form *a perfect system of theology*, a rich *Commentary on the Old Testament Scriptures*, and a *practical treatise* on every day christian duties. 1. Taking for granted the fundamental truths of religion as revealed in nature and in the Jewish scriptures, he proceeded to erect a glorious edifice of Gospel Theology, adapted to the wants of the world and a safe refuge against error, superstition and vice. Compared with this edifice, how mean do the man-made creeds and theological systems of our day appear. His was a heavenly theology, glowing like himself on Tabor, with ineffable splendor. Its corner-stone was, "God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," and its cap-stone was, "Lo ! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Christ as the

had descended from heaven, and that he who is the seed of David, according to the flesh, is God over all, blessed forever." *Krauth on the Transfiguration.*

unspeakable gift of God to the Church, and Christ ever present with his Church to sanctify and save, is the substance of the evangelical Theology as taught by the Redeemer of men. 2. The law and the prophets he expounded and applied, while he kept the one and fulfilled the other. He revealed at a stroke the extent and spirituality of the moral law, and gave in his own life the key, that unlocked the store-house of prophecy and promise, type and figure. "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" was the startling announcement which fell from his lips as he read the book of the prophets to the blinded Jews. The dark sayings of David and Isaiah and Jeremiah and Micah were dark no longer. He interpreted while he fulfilled, and supplemented the law with the Gospel so as to form a complete and perfect whole, without joint or fastening like his own seamless garment. 3. In the sphere of human duty he made straight and plain the path of rectitude and virtue. Duty to God he embraced in the wide-reaching injunction, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind," and duty to man he condensed into the burning focus, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." Under these comprehensive formulae he ranged all the round of human conduct, assigning each duty its appropriate place in the harmonious whole. Repentance, faith, love, humility, zeal, charity, honesty, holiness, all revolved around these great centres as planets around these central orbs. But not only on present relations and duties did he discourse. Ever and anon he enforced his words and encouraged or warned his hearers by revealing the solemnities of the future. The retributions of eternity, the crown of righteousness and the blackness of despair, his certain and speedy return to judge the world, the resurrection of the dead, and the final awards of the judgment-day, were all displayed in graphic description and parable to the minds of those who heard him. His discourses on these points form a grand apocalypse of future events. He truly "brought life and immortality to light," and unveiled the scenes that lie beyond the grave, sufficiently to satisfy all reasonable desires. No man, with the Savior's teachings in his hand, can go to perdition, blindfolded. He cannot but see the gulf before him and the way of escape. If he be lost he will have but himself to blame forever.

In all this we see Christ as the great oracle, through whom Divinity spoke to man. In the man Christ Jesus, dwelt the

Shekinah of the Mosaic age, divested of its unsubstantial and mysterious cloud, and clothed in human form, sympathizing with human wants and woes, relieving human suffering and enlightening human ignorance. It speaks no more in vague responses. It utters no uncertain sound. Clearly and distinctly are all the great truths affecting man's relation to God or his fellow man set forth. None consulted it in vain. The way-side beggar and the Jewish Rabbi, the Samaritan women and the Roman Governor, the dying thief and the reigning king, all obtained responses suited to their condition. No High Priest was needed as a mediator. No Moses need intervene. The Shekinah was human and dwelt among men, conversed with men, instructed men, and left on record lessons of high and holy import which all may learn and become wise unto salvation. The Shekinah in Christ finished and crowned the communications which the Shekinah in former ages began.

To the latest hour of the Savior's sojourn upon earth he continued thus to act as the channel of communication between God and man, the oracle of humanity, the Shekinah of Deity. And when he had, at length finished his work in the flesh, when the sufferings of Calvary and the humiliation of the grave had been passed, and the Chariot-cloud had received him from Mount Olivet and carried him triumphantly to his seat at the right hand of the Father in heaven, he ceased not to diffuse light and truth through the world. According to his promise he shed forth the Holy Spirit and endowed his Apostles with power to teach and write with his own infallibility. Through these he continued his work of communication, appearing to Paul in the Shekinah brilliancy of former ages, and blinding him with its splendor, while he communicated through it his will, till he finally closes the record of revelation in the glorious display of himself in the midst of the golden candlesticks to John on Patmos. Robed once more in the drapery of the Shekinah as it appeared at Horeb and Sinai, with a voice as the sound of many waters, the eternal Son of God proclaimed the closing chapters of the inspired volume and sealed up the book of books till his return again to earth. And now the Shekinah's responses are ended, his manifestations are visible no more. We live in a dispensation of the Spirit. No Burning Bush, or Fiery Pillar, or Oracle over the Mercy seat, gives audible responses or sheds visible glory on the world. The Bible is our oracle. Its moral glory illuminates the earth. In it are seen the

beauty and majesty, the truth and mercy of our God. It is the Shekinah of our age. The Church of Christ founded upon it is the Israel of God, journeying through life's wilderness to the Canaan above. And shall there never more be a visible, real Shekinah among men? Will God no more appear to human eyes in flaming symbol or outward form? There is a hope, well founded we hold, that a higher, grander, more glorious Shekinah is yet to come. In a future age, when earth keeps jubilee a thousand years, when the New Jerusalem with its gemmed foundations and its temple-worship, descends from God, then will a great voice out of heaven proclaim, "Behold the tabernacle (*ἡ σκηνὴ*) is with men, and HE will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and GOD himself, shall be with them and be their God." And in that glorious city, we read, there shall be "no night," and yet no sun nor moon nor candle to enlighten it; "for the Lord God giveth them light, and the Lamb is the light thereof." Is there no intimation in these predictions of the Shekinah returning to our earth in a more glorious form than was ever witnessed before? Will not Christ, in his glorified body, reigning on Mount Zion in millennial splendor, be the last grand manifestation of Divinity to humanity, the final display of the Shekinah on earth? We ask these questions, but do not attempt to answer them. A field, too dim and shadowy for profitable investigation, opens in that direction. It has had and will yet have many explorers. We wish them well but will not join their number. We have endeavored to glance at the important and far-reaching subject presented in our heading. It has been, we know, but a feeble attempt to grasp this grand theme, yet if it but add a single mite to any reader's store of knowledge on the subject and stimulate abler pens to do it ampler justice, we shall be abundantly satisfied and repaid for our labor.

ARTICLE III.

ISRAEL UNDER THE SECOND GREAT MONARCHY.

By Rev. R. Hill, A. M., Hagerstown, Md.

HISTORIANS, in making up the records of the world, usually recognize four great ruling powers, which have followed

each other in immediate succession, each, in its turn giving shape to the destinies of the human family. These were the Babylonian Empire, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian and the Roman. History, in this distribution of imperial authority, confirms the announcement of Prophecy. These four powers were symbolized by the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. (Dan. 2: 31.) The chief characteristic of each may be understood from the gold, silver, brass and iron. (Dan. 2: 38-40.) They are also represented by the four beasts in Daniel's vision, (7: 1-7.) The characteristics by which they may be distinguished are here set forth, in the first as a lion, in the second as a bear, in the third as a leopard, but the fourth was dreadful beyond description. The second and third of these powers, are indicated in the vision of the ram and the he-goat, (Dan. 8: 1-7,) for it is said that the ram having two horns is the empire of the Medes and Persians, (8: 20).

This second great monarchy dates from the fall of Babylon by Cyrus, about B. C. 536, to the conquest of Persia by Alexander, about B. C. 335, making its continuance 201 years. During this period a number of kings wielded the sceptre of universal dominion, by the authority of the Persian crown, of whom it will be necessary to give some account individually, in order to understand the relations the people of God sustained to the power which had the rule over them.

CYRUS. (B. C. 536-529.)*

The Medo-Persian Empire originated in the union of the two governments of the Medes and Persians. Media began to exist, as a separate government, soon after the destruction of the great Assyrian Empire. Arbaces, the principal head of the conspiracy against Sardanapalus, established it as a kingdom about 747 B. C., and thus it existed until the time of Cyrus.

Persia was originally a small mountainous district of Western Asia, lying on the north eastern side of the Persian Gulf, and surrounded on the other sides by mountains and deserts. While the Medes were rich, luxurious and effeminate, the Persians were poor, active and hardy. Cambyses, king of Persia, obtained in marriage the hand of Mandane, who was the daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes. Thus

* The chronology followed in this article, is that of our common English Bible, except in the events recorded in the book of Esther.

the two reigning families of the two neighboring countries were connected. The first issue of this marriage was a son who received the name of Cyrus. This child was heir-apparent to the Persian crown, while he was but one step removed from that of Media. Xenophon represents him as very sprightly and precocious. After his twelfth year he resided at his Grandfather's court until his seventeenth. This was a great benefit to him, as he there possessed many advantages for his development, which he could not have enjoyed at home. One of these, was the opportunity of perfecting himself in the art of horsemanship, as horses were not kept in Persia. "During his residence at this court, his behavior procured him infinite love and esteem. He was gentle, affable, anxious to oblige, beneficent and generous." In order that he might complete his course of education in the Persian exercises, his father recalled him after he had spent five years in learning the manners and customs of the Medes, which was doubtless of great advantage to him in his future career, when he fell heir to the united kingdom. One year before the birth of Cyrus, his uncle Cyaxares succeeded to the Median throne. The Babylonians, observing the growing sympathy between the Medes and Persians, began to fear their united power. They therefore formed an alliance with some of the neighboring powers, and began to fit out an armament for the invasion of Media. Cyaxares becoming alarmed, sent to Cambyses for assistance. Cyrus was placed at the head of an army of 30,000 picked men and sent to the succor of his uncle. The king of Armenia, who was a tributary of Cyaxares, considering this a favorable juncture, attempted to throw off the yoke. Before entering the field against the Babylonians therfore, it was thought best to quell this disturbance. Cyrus and his Persians marched against the rebels and subdued them. The Chaldeans were then at war with Armenia. Having subdued the latter, the conqueror espoused their cause, and was soon triumphant over the enemy. And now he returned to Cyaxares, laden with treasures, and his army greatly augmented. They were at length prepared to meet the Babylonians. But Cyrus, impatient of delay, proposed not to await the attack but to invade the enemies' territory. A bloody battle was fought, in which Cyrus was completely victorious, and the Babylonians totally put to the rout. Upon this defeat their allies, among whom was Croesus king of Lydia, forsook them. The triumphant warrior did not advance at once upon Babylon, but sought

first to obtain possession of the tributaries of that stronghold and lead away the subjects of the great monarch. In this he was very successful, and having greatly augmented his forces through these recent allies, he advanced near to the city. His object was not to attack it, but to gain such information in reference to the situation, strength and surroundings of Babylon, as might be of great importance in a future campaign. Having been thus far successful, he returned to Media to make further preparations for carrying on the war. On his return to Ecbatana, his uncle Cyaxares was so much pleased, that he gave him his daughter in marriage, and as her dower, the heirship of the Median crown. The king of Babylon took this opportunity, in the absence of his enemy, to form a new coalition against him. Hastening to Lydia, he succeeded in enlisting Croesus again in his cause, and together with him both Egypt and all the nations of Asia Minor. They gathered an army of many thousands and placed the rich king at the head as generalissimo. In the mean time Cyrus was not inactive. Having received supplies of money from India, and reinforcements of troops from home, he advanced with the utmost celerity upon the enemy, and gained a great victory at the battle of Thymbra.

This battle decided the empire of Asia in favor of the Persians, and also secured to them a profitable alliance with Egypt. Cyrus now advanced upon Sardis, besieged the city, and took it by assault. Croesus with all his treasures fell into his hands. This unfortunate king was ever after the faithful friend and servant of his conqueror. Going on from one victory to another, Cyrus soon found himself master of all Asia Minor.

Then he subjugated one after another, the countries of Syria, Arabia and Assyria, so that Babylon alone stood out against his authority. Against this last and strongest power he directed all his energies. He besieged the city, cast a trench about it, turned the Euphrates from its course and while the king and his subjects, lured by their false security, were indulging in excess of drunkenness and sacrilegious revelry, entered through the bed of the river, and Belshazzer's power was gone. Cyrus took possession of Babylon in the name of his uncle Cyaxares, hence it is said, "Darius the Median took the throne," (Dan. 5: 31.) Here commences a new order of things in the empire of the Medes and Persians. The whole realm was divided into a hundred and twenty provinces, and a governor or satrap set over each. Cyax-

ares, (Darius), remained at Babylon to administer the affairs of government, while Cyrus went to establish the authority in distant parts. In the meantime Cambyses, his father died and left him the Persian kingdom. At the end of two years from the taking of Babylon, Cyaxares also died, and left him the crown of Media, and now Cyrus holds undisputed sway over the united empire. He established himself in Babylon,* and ruled his vast domain with wisdom and rectitude for seven years.

DANIEL.

During the time that Cyrus was growing up and running his career of glory, the people of God were groaning in bondage under the power of Babylon. As a punishment for their rebellion against divine statutes, they were delivered into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, (Dan. 1: 1) and doomed to a doleful captivity of seventy years, (Jer. 25: 11). But God never leaves his people without hope, however great may be the affliction through which he causes them to pass. He gives to the doomed captives the earnest of coming deliverance by the mouth of his prophets, (Jer. 25: 11,) (Is. 47: 6). Among the captives led to Babylon was a youth by the name of Daniel. He was admitted to the court of Nebuchadnezzar, (Dan. 1: 4), and grew up and matured in the school of the Magians. He obtained great celebrity not only by his wisdom and prudence as a man, but especially by the ability which God gave him to interpret the dreams of the king. During the reign of Belshazzar, however, he seems to have been forgotten until the mysterious hand writing on the wall appeared in the palace, when he was remembered by the queen, (Dan. 5: 10,) and brought in to explain the mystery. Then was the kingdom given to the Medes and Persians, and the authority over the people of God was changed. Darius (Cyaxares) set over the whole kingdom, one hundred and twenty princes, and over these princes, three presidents, of whom Daniel was one. And Daniel was preferred above the others, so that the king thought to place him over the whole realm, (Dan. 6: 1-3). This excited the envy of the others, and they determined to seek the destruction of the man who stood in their way. They prevailed upon the king to sign a decree that no man should ask a petition of any God or man

*The principal residence of the Medo-Persian kings was soon after transferred to Susa.

for thirty days, except of the king. Nevertheless, Daniel prayed and made supplication before his God, and Darius, who was bound by his irrevocable decree, necessarily permitted the prophet to be cast into the den of lions. Daniel was preserved, but his enemies were cast into the den and destroyed. Then Daniel was exalted to higher honors than ever, and a special decree commanded, "That in every dominion, men tremble before the God of Daniel."

Darius dying at the end of two years after the taking of Babylon, Cyrus became sole and undisputed monarch of both Persia and Media together with all the countries he had subdued by the force of arms. With the beginning of the reign of Cyrus, ended the seventy years of captivity. Daniel perceiving the time of the captivity about to close, prayed most earnestly that God would fulfil his promise and the expectation of his people, (Dan. 9,) by a manifestation of his almighty power on their behalf. Not doubting the efficacy of prayer, he still did not despise the use of other means, to accomplish the end his heart so much desired. Confident of the power that Jehovah exercised over the hearts of men, he went to the king with the prophecies of Isaiah in his hands, and shewed him that God had called him by name and appointed him a work to do many years before he was born; saying (Is. 44: 28,) of Cyrus, "He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid." The king, convinced that there was a God above, from whom he had received all his greatness, and believing that he had chosen him to a great work, felt his heart stirred within him with a strong desire to fulfil his sacred mission. And in accordance with this pious impulse of his soul, he issued the following decree, (Ezra 1: 2-3), "Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, the Lord God of heaven, hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him a house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people, his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God,) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth let the men of his place help him with silver and with gold and with goods and with beasts besides the free will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem."

ZERUBABEL.

The prophets and teachers of the Israelites in bondage, had been for some time turning their attention to the promised emancipation and the return to Jerusalem. Already in the second year of Darius, (Zec. 1: 1-7-12-16,) Zechariah received the assurance that God was "jealous for Jerusalem" and that both it and the Lord's house should be built. In the same vision he also received intelligence, that Zerubabel should both lay the foundations of the Temple and finish the superstructure, (Zec. 4: 9). The people were not, therefore, unprepared for the glorious event, when the decree of deliverance and restoration came. Multitudes were ready at any moment to leave the land of their captivity forever and to go "with singing unto Zion." About fifty thousand joined the standard of Zerubabel, under whose conduct they arrived safely at the site of the city of their fathers, (Ez. 2: 64, 65.) The first duty on reaching the place for which their souls had longed, was to separate a part of their substance for the building of the house of the Lord. The next, after seeking an abiding place for themselves, was to build an altar on which to offer the daily sacrifice, (Ez. 3: 2). It was not until the second year of their arrival, that Zerobabal supposed them to be sufficiently established to commence the erection of the temple. But when it was begun, it was in the highest degree of religious zeal. The foundation was laid amid the sound of trumpet and cymbal, and the voice of singing and the shouts of the rejoicing multitudes. But some of the aged who had seen the first temple, wept when they remembered Zion of old, (Ez. 3: 12). The sacred walls were rapidly rising, when Satan, always ready to oppose the work of the Lord, put it into the hearts of the Samaritans to hinder the work. They first offer to render assistance, but Zerubabel, perceiving their treachery, and remembering the command of Moses, "Thou shalt make no covenant with them," refused their proffered aid, (Ez. 4: 3). Chagrined and disappointed, they turn away to plot in secret how they may weaken the hands of the people of Judah, and hence for six centuries the Jews and the Samaritans had "no dealings," (Jno. 4: 9). With these hindrances to oppose it, the work went on slowly for some years.

CAMBYSES. (529—522.)

After a long career of uninterrupted prosperity, and a peaceful and useful reign of seven years over his vast empire, Cyrus perceived that the moment of his dissolution was drawing near. He therefore called the rulers about him together with his sons, proceeded to speak of his decease and of the motives and maxims they should follow when he was no more. It was on this occasion he designated his eldest son Cambyses, as his successor in the regal office. He then conjured his children to live together in peace, and bade them a final farewell, when "he covered his face and died, equally lamented by all his people."

Cambyses takes up the reins of government, but he exhibited little in his character, but a monstrosity of wickedness and cruelty. He reigned seven years and five months. Soon after he came to the throne he set on foot an expedition against Egypt, instigated by personal revenge. Having made vast preparations and having collected a numerous army, he directed his course towards Egypt. Having a brother by the name of Smerdis, who was possessed of great physical strength and mental acuteness, he feared to leave him at home, lest he should usurp the throne in his absence. Hence he resolved that he should accompany the army, and the government was left in the hands of two Magians.

Having arrived in Egypt, he discovered that Amasis, the object of his hatred was dead, but his son and successor was prepared to protect his dominions from the ravages of the invader. But in war the weaker must yield to the stronger. Cambyses swept, like a scourge, the fertile valley of the Nile. When he came to the city of Sais, which contained the tombs of the kings of Egypt, he ordered the body of Amasis to be disinterred, and having offered it a thousand indignities, consigned it to the flames. Not satisfied with the destruction of Egypt, he resolved to head an expedition against the Ethiopians. Accordingly he sent spies, whom he called ambassadors, to the court of Ethiopia. They returned with a very heavy bow, and with the message, that when the Persians can use a bow of this size and strength, then let them attack the Ethiopians. No man in the whole army could bend the bow except Smerdis. This caused his existing popularity to be increased so greatly that the jealousy of the king was changed into envy and fear, lest his brother should usurp the command. To rid himself of these troubles, he sent him back to Persia. But now his original fears respecting the govern-

ment were renewed, and he resolved to remove the whole difficulty by sending an assassin to take the life of his brother, which was accomplished by the hand of Prexaspes. While in Egypt, this monster of iniquity married his own sister, who soon after died a victim of his ungovernable rage. He deliberately killed the youthful son of his best friend, before his father's eyes, because he had told him the truth at his own request. He also caused several of his principal men to be buried alive. The expedition against the Ethiopians was a signal failure. Disheartened and burning with rage, Cambyses turned his steps towards Persia, in the eighth year of his reign. Passing through Syria, the army encamped at a little village called Ecbatana. While here, a herald from Susa came into the village with the proclamation that Smerdis was king, and demanding obedience to his edicts. The unhappy monster was wild with fury and alarm. He knew that his brother was dead, hence he was convinced that it must be one of the Magians, in whose care he had left the government, whose name was also Smerdis, who was guilty of this bold act of treachery. Calling upon his best cavalry, he mounts his steed in hot haste. In mounting, his sword fell from its scabbard and inflicted a mortal wound in his thigh. He was unable to proceed, and after lingering a few days, he died in great agony.

THE WORK OF THE TEMPLE HINDERED. (529.)

Little could be expected from such a monster of cruelty and infamy. We are not surprised, therefore, to learn that the servants of God were hindered in their pious enterprise at Jerusalem. Unable to effect anything during the reign of Cyrus, the Samaritans rejoiced when a new monarch was on the throne. No sooner had Cambyses (Ahasueras,) assumed the government than they wrote unto him "an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem," (Ez, 4: 6.) The import of this letter, according to Josephus, is, that the building of the city and market places and the Temple was going forward rapidly, and that the great probability was, that when fully established, the Jews would assert their independence, resume their ancient dignity, and refuse to pay tribute. However much the monarch may have been incensed, and however great his desire to comply with the wishes of these enemies of the good work, he does not yet seem so debased, as to disregard and abrogate his father's decree. Nevertheless so many discouragements were laid upon the Jews, as

effectually to frustrate the designs of Cyrus. Little was accomplished during this reign.

SMERDIS. (521.)

When Cambyses set out on his expedition against Egypt and Ethiopia, he left the realm in charge of two priests or Magi, who were brothers, named Patisithes and Smerdis. As the king was so long absent on his military campaigns, and as Smerdis, his brother, was secretly assassinated, the priests thought it would be an easy matter to usurp the throne in the name of the murdered prince. This they had done as we have seen when the monarch was about to return and resume the power they had so long wielded. To leave the people under the impression that the usurper was Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, the plan was that Smerdis being of the same name as the king's brother, should personate him, and keeping himself concealed and disguised as much as possible, be called king, while Patisithes was to administer the government as prime minister. The death of Cambyses at this juncture, was well calculated to further their designs. Although the dying monarch confessed to his principal officers the assassination of his brother, yet so strongly were the usurpers established at Susa, that no one dared to bring charge against them publicly, nor even to speak of it secretly but at the risk of his life. Thus elapsed about seven months, when a conspiracy of seven Persian noblemen developed itself which resulted in the discovery of the fraud, and assassination of the perpetrators.

THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE SUSPENDED. (521.)

This usurper is called in Scripture Artaxerxes, (Ezra 4:7.) The enemies of the Jews about Jerusalem, men in authority, wrote a second accusation against the people of God, wherein they state that Jerusalem had been a rebellious city in past time; that this was the cause of its destruction, and that by permitting it to be rebuilt, the king would be likely to lose the tribute of all the country this side the river Euphrates, (Ezra 4: 11-16.) After an investigation was made among the records, the king replied that what they had stated was true, and gave commandment that the work should immediately cease. About two years of the most discouraging suspense passed in Jerusalem. The people had labored long and hard at the foundation of the temple. They had resisted the strongest opposition. They had endured the great-

est hardships and privations. They bravely stood by their altars and their homes. They builded the city of their father's sepulchres. But now as their labor and toil was showing itself in naked walls they were compelled by "force and power" to desist. How their hearts must have sunk within them! What a dark cloud of discouragement must have brooded over their spirits! But faith was able, with unerring vision, to pierce that portentous cloud, and give the evidence of things not seen, and impart substance to the things yet hoped for. The tyrant who dared to oppose the designs of the Almighty, is violently hurled from the pedestal of power, and his momentary greatness trails in the dust. Another is preferred before him, who is willing to restore the force of the original decree and defend the rights of the oppressed.

DARIUS HYSTASPES. (521—486.)

Seven Persian noblemen, as has already been stated, entered into a conspiracy against the Magian imposter. Before their plans had matured, there came to the great Capital a young man by the name of Ochus, the son of Hystaspes, the governor of the province of Persia. Him, the conspirators admitted into their councils, and from that moment he was entirely identified with the movement. The success of the plot was chiefly owing to his foresight and decision. After the conspiracy had accomplished its design, in the assassination of Smerdis, the city was of course thrown into confusion. Anarchy reigned supreme. No measures were taken by the people to re-establish the government and restore order, all seeming to look to the conspirators for some new development, and manifesting a disposition to acquiesce in any determination on which they may resolve. Feeling that the power was in their hands, they assumed the responsibility of providing for the future government of the mighty realm. When first convened for the purpose of making this provision, a difference of opinion prevailed as to the form they should give to the incoming administration. A democracy was suggested as likely to protect and preserve, most effectually, the rights of the people. Against this was urged the popular ignorance, and the power of the demagogue; and an aristocracy suggested as the happy medium, between monarchical oppression and popular licentiousness and demagogic misrule. Ochus, however, remarked that it was by a monarchy that the Persian empire had attained present greatness, and in his opinion the proper form of government to be adopted.

This latter opinion prevailed. But the highly important question now arose, who should bear the royal dignity? The answer to this question they agreed, should be determined by the Gods, and the following expedient was adopted to ascertain their will: Each was to mount his horse, early the next morning, and repair to an appointed place in the suburbs of the city at sunrise. The nobleman, whose horse should first neigh, after they had thus come together, was to be king. This distinction was secured to Ochus, through an artifice of his groom. He was therefore duly declared king over the whole realm, and assumed the government under the name of Darius, with the seven noblemen as his privileged counselors, (*Ezra 7: 14.*)

In history he is called Darius the Great. For thirty-six years he swayed the sceptre with undisputed power and great effect. His reign was not however without its difficulties and reverses. During the revolutions in the great Persian government, by the usurpation of the Magi, and the accession of Darius, a spirit of revolt* was ripening in Babylon. The rebellion manifested itself in the fifth year of Darius. Having collected vast stores of provisions, the inhabitants retired within the impregnable walls and, closing the gates, bade defiance to sovereign authority. In order that the provision might not fail in the protracted siege they anticipated, they resorted to the horrible expedient of destroying, with their own hands, all the inhabitants who were not necessary in the defence of the city, only each soldier was permitted to retain one wife and a servant. The siege continued twenty months and then the city was taken by stratagem, and the walls leveled with the ground and the prophecy of Isaiah was fulfilled. (50: 15.) "Her foundations are fallen, her walls are thrown down." After the reduction of Babylon, Darius collected a large army for the purpose of making war upon the Scythians, who were a half civilized people sparsely inhabiting a great extent of country beyond the Danube. We search in vain for a justifying cause for this movement. The pretext on which it was vindicated, was an irruption of savage hordes from the same region upon the Persians, one hundred and twenty years before. It was, however, against the advice of his wisest counselor, that the king undertook this expedition, which he had so much just reason afterwards to regret. His

* The principal cause of this revolt, was the removal of the imperial dignity, "which very much diminished Babylon's wealth and grandeur," Rollin. vol. 1, p. 196.

forces consisted of seven hundred thousand men, and a fleet of six hundred ships. His march to the Bosphorus resembled a triumphal procession. He crossed the Bosphorus on a bridge of boats, and then easily made himself master of Thrace, and came to the Danube, which was the border of Scythia. Across this river he threw a bridge of boats, and thus the army passed into the enemies territory. But the invasion of an uncultivated country, with a large army, is a very hazardous undertaking. The horrors of famine were soon experienced, and inevitable destruction to the whole army was manifest if they should proceed further, so that a precipitate retreat was resolved on. Just at this juncture there came a herald into the camp from the Scythian authorities to present to Darius a bird, a mouse, a frog and five arrows, to show how little he was dreaded. When asked the meaning of these things, the messenger replied, that he had no authority to explain their significance, but it was for the Persians to discover. The interpretation that the counselors of Darius gave of the message, was this, "The Scythians mean to say: Unless you can fly like a bird, or hide yourself in the ground like a mouse, or dive under the water like a frog, you shall in no way be able to avoid the arrows of the Scythians." With much difficulty, a retreat across the Danube was accomplished. Passing on through Sardis, he returned to Susa, having gained nothing by the war, but valuable experience. The Scythians revenged the invasion of their rights by passing the Danube, and sweeping over Thrace like a scourge all the way to the Hellespont. The ambitious spirit of Darius could not be satisfied with the administration of his vast government, and the pursuit of the arts of peace at his Capital. He looked about for a field of conquest. The East took his attention, and its wealth excited his cupidity. India was marked as his victim. Having first organized, and sent out an expedition of discovery, he afterwards entered India with a large army, and effected its subjugation, and added it to his dominions. But he was not destined to be successful in all his undertakings. Especially was this the case with his designs upon Greece. The following in the mode in which he became inveterately pledged to hostility against that country: His Ionian subjects organized a very dangerous rebellion against his authority. Into this effort to resist the Persian power, they succeeded in bringing the city of Athens, which furnished twenty ships to add to the forces of the revolt. The insurgents, together with their Athenian

allies, proceeded directly to Sardis, and burned it to the ground, except the citadel, which they were not able to force. The rebellion was afterwards quelled, and the Athenians of course driven from the Persian territory. But the burning of Sardis left a wound in the proud heart of Darius which was not easily healed. He thirsted for revenge. He resolved to make war upon Greece, and this resolution he never forgot, for "he commanded one of his officers to cry out to him every night when he was at supper, 'Sir, remember the Athenians!'" In the twenty-eighth year of his reign he began to carry out this purpose of his heart. Mardonius, a son-in-law of the king, was sent at the head of a large army to invade and conquer Greece in general, but specially to take summary vengeance upon Athens, by burning it to ashes. The Macedonians, terrified at the Persian power, gave themselves up. But the fleet, endeavoring to double Mount Athos, was overtaken by so violent a storm, that it was entirely wrecked, and the land forces were cut off in a battle with the Thracians. A new armament was immediately fitted out, and placed under the command of Datis and Artaphernes. They went directly to Eretria, on the island of Eubœa, and committed it to the flames, and sent the inhabitants in chains to Susa. Thence they directed their course towards Athens, with the design of bringing upon it a like fate. They landed at Marathon, a little town some distance from Athens. Here it was upon the plains of Marathon, that Miltiades, at the head of ten thousand Athenians, who felt that they were defending their altars and their firesides, met and repulsed one hundred and ten thousand Persians, and gained a victory which has filled the world with his fame. The Persians hastened to their ships and returned to Susa. This second failure poured oil upon the fires of revenge that were burning in the heart of Darius. He determined at once to make greater preparations than ever, and march in person to the destruction of Athens. But he was prevented from carrying out this design by that great Sovereign of all the living, who appoints to each his bounds that he cannot pass. Having spent three full years in gathering stores and equipments for the new war, on a most magnificent scale, he died, leaving his plans to be executed by those who came after him.

THE WORK OF THE TEMPLE RESUMED. (519.)

For two whole years nothing had been done towards the erection of the temple, (Esdras 573.) The impious decree of

Smerdis disheartened the people. They did not dare to disobey the command of their earthly sovereign, although it was in direct opposition to the order of Jehovah. And when their leaders pleaded the superior force of the higher law, the people were ready to offer various excuses to justify themselves in their neglect of the Temple. Some said, that the time had not yet come, (Hag. 1: 2,) meaning that the time of the captivity was not yet ended, thus endeavoring to extenuate their lack of interest in the work of the Lord. For this wickedness, God sent famine upon them, (Hag. 1: 6). At the same time he exhorted them to resume the work, (Hag. 1: 8,) giving them the assurance of his presence, and saying that although in all outward respects this second temple would be as nothing in comparison with the first, (Hag. 2: 4,) yet it should be filled with his glory, by the presence of the Messiah, (Hag. 2: 7). Being stirred up by the preaching of the prophets, and encouraged by these gracious promises of God, the people again commenced the building of the temple. But no sooner were they thus successfully engaged, than the Samaritans, filled with malice and envy, again undertook to thwart their pious purposes. Tatnai, the governor, moved by the clamor of his subjects, wrote to Darius of the progress that was going on in Jerusalem, stating that the Jews pleaded the authority of a decree by Cyrus, for the reconstruction of their temple and city, (Ezra 5: 8-9). When search was made among the records of the acts of Cyrus, the decree was found which not only granted liberty to build, but also made provision to furnish the funds out of the king's treasury, (Ez. 6: 4). Having respect to the memory of Cyrus, Darius confirmed his decree, and ordered Tatnai to defend the rights claimed by the Jews and expend the revenues of his province in the improvement of the holy city. What joy must have lighted up the countenances and thrilled the souls of the liberated captives, when this proclamation was read in their hearing! How faithful are the promises of God to his people! How soon are they fulfilled to them that act as though they believed! New zeal fired the people of God, and caused them to double their diligence and activity, insomuch that in three years the temple was completed. In the sixth year of Darius this great work was finished, which had been commenced in the third of Cyrus, the whole time of its erection covering twenty years. With great joy, all the people kept the dedication, (B. C. 515). The temple being fin-

ished and fitted up for all parts of the Mosaic service, the Passover was celebrated for the first time since the captivity, in the second month after its completion. This is the last we read in Scriptures of the Jews under the reign of Darius. Josephus (Antq. lib. 11, c. 4,) adds that after the main building of the Temple was completed, the Samaritans refused to pay tribute any longer, as ordered in the decree of Cyrus and Darius, alleging as a justification of their refusal, that the demand was only for the reconstruction of the temple, and not for keeping up the services afterwards. Upon this, the Jews, acting on the defensive, sent Zerubabel and others to Darius, with the complaint that the tribute was refused. In a short time they returned with a new decree, confirming all their former rights and privileges and compelling the Samaritans to continue the same tribute they had formerly paid.

XERXES. (485—465.)

After Darius came to the Persian throne, he married Atossa, who was a daughter of Cyrus. Of this union Xerxes was the first born. But Darius had other sons of another wife before he came to the throne, of whom Artabazanes was the eldest. When the question of the succession was agitated, a dispute arose concerning the title to the crown. Artabazanes claimed it on the ground that it was the custom of all nations to award it to the eldest son of the deceased monarch. And he, being the eldest son of Darius, was rightful heir to the crown. Xerxes replied that the crown to be disposed of, was the crown of Cyrus, and it seemed more just that a descendant of Cyrus should wear it, than that it should be given to a stranger.

He being the son of Atossa, who was the daughter of Cyrus, was therefore the grandson of the great founder of the empire, and on this account he claimed the crown. He also added, that although Artabazanes was indeed the eldest son of *Darius*, yet he, (Xerxes), was the eldest son of the king, being the first born after he had received the kingdom, whereas the other had been born while he was a private citizen. At length it was peacefully decided that Xerxes should wear the regal honors, and Artabazanes cheerfully did homage to him as king. He ascended the throne, (B. C. 485,) and for twenty years ruled, according to his own will, the empire of the Persians in its palmiest days. In him was fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet Daniel, (xi: 2,) "Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia, and the

fourth shall be richer than they all." The prosperity of the empire had here reached its culminating point. Its resources seem to have been almost without bounds. But, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther," had been decreed and here the "star of empire" began to lose its lustre. Xerxes, on the death of his father Darius, found himself in possession of all that an ambitious and an unsanctified heart could desire; wealth without bounds and power without limit. Materials were also ready at hand prepared by Darius for the greatest military campaign the page of history has yet recorded. But the condition of things would not permit him immediately to enter upon the contemplated expedition against Greece. Egypt was in a state of revolt, and this claimed his first attention. Accordingly he invaded Egypt in the second year of his reign, and placed it again under the Persian yoke, leaving the control of its affairs to his brother. Hastening home, flushed with his success, he turned all his energies towards the execution of his father's designs against Greece. Four years were now spent in enlisting forces, gathering equipments and supplying the line of march with provisions. That no effort might be wanting which would in any degree conduce to the success of his plans, he formed a coalition with the Carthaginians. By this league it was determined that the latter should attack the Grecian interests in Italy and Sicily, so as to divert their assistance from their allies in Greece, while Xerxes should accomplish its subjugation. Hamilcar was the Carthaginian general in this war. Thus having, according to prophecy, (Dan. xi: 2,) "Stirred up all against the realm of Grecia," he set out on his march early in the sixth year of his reign. The vast multitude moved along the line of march, increasing as it advanced, until the numbers were almost beyond computation. The Hellespont was spanned by two bridges of boats, one for the army, and one for the beasts of burden, in crossing which, seven days and nights were consumed. Xerxes, at the head of this multitude, carried all before him until he came to the Straits of Thermopylae, when twenty-six different nations were represented in his army, which now reached the astounding number, according to the best authorities, of more than five millions of human beings.

Thermopylae was a narrow pass lying "between Mount Oeta and an inaccessible morass forming the edge of the Maliac Gulf." It afforded room for but a single carriage to pass, and yet was the only way by which an enemy could

penetrate from northern into southern Greece. The triumphal march of Xerxes was here, for the first time contested. Leonidas, with his three hundred Spartans, together with about four thousand other Greeks, defended the pass and disputed his progress. Nor would he have been able to force his way, but for a secret path over the mountain by which he conveyed a large number of Persians to the rear of the Grecian forces. The latter perceiving themselves about to be attacked from behind, escaped for their lives, except the immortal three hundred and their intrepid leader, who, being assaulted both in front and rear, soon fell under the power of overwhelming numbers. Xerxes passed in triumph over their dead bodies, though it was at a loss of twenty thousand men, and two of his own brothers. From this point, Xerxes pursued his course directly to Athens, which being deserted at his approach, he entered without opposition. But while he succeeded on the land he failed on the sea. He witnessed the battle of Salamis off the coast of Attica, in which he beheld two hundred of his ships destroyed, and his entire fleet totally defeated. About the same time Hamilcar was slain at Himera, in Sicily, and all his Carthaginians put to the rout. Xerxes beholding the aspect of affairs thus suddenly changed, began to fear for his own safety. Leaving Mardonius with an army of three hundred thousand men to carry on the war, he made a precipitate flight towards Asia Minor, by way of the Hellespont, which he crossed in an humble fisher's boat. How the mighty had fallen, and the weapons of war perished ! Mardonius made proposals of peace to the Athenians, but they were peremptorily refused, whereupon he entered Athens a second time and burnt it to the ground. Having accomplished the total destruction of that renowned city, he withdrew his forces to the plains of Boetia. Thither he was followed by the united Grecian forces, and there took place the battle of Plataea, which resulted in the destruction of nearly three hundred thousand Persians, and the freedom of all Greece from the terror of Persian rule.

On the same day that witnessed the battle of Plataea, also occurred the battle of Mycale on the coast of Asia Minor. In this latter conflict, nearly all the remaining forces of Xerxes, both on land and sea were destroyed. The war still continued to be carried on along the coast of Asia Minor, through nearly all the remaining part of Xerxes' reign. But the Greeks were now the aggressors and the Persians ac-

ted on the defensive. At last, Xerxes, growing weary of contention, ceased to carry on the war. Giving himself up wholly to pleasure and sensual gratification, he soon became obnoxious to the people, and through a plot of Artabanes, captain of the king's guard, he was assassinated in the twenty-first year of his reign.

ESTHER.* (483.)

In the third year of Ahasuerus (Xerxes), in order to gratify the vanity of his heart, the inflated monarch made a great feast, to which he invited all the princes of his one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, and thus spent six months in feasting and revelry, and displaying before the multitudes all his inherited greatness. Intoxicated with the adulation of his guests, and excited with wine, he commanded his seven chamberlains (Esth. 1: 10,) to bring Vashti the Queen, of whose beauty he was wont to boast, and exhibit her before the multitude. But she refused to obey the command of her royal husband, for it was considered highly indecorous for a Persian lady of rank to appear in the presence of strange gentlemen. This opposition to his whimsical fancy greatly exasperated the king, and according to the advice of his counselors he caused her to be divorced by an irrevocable decree, which was published throughout the whole empire, that wives might hence learn to honor their husbands. But when the excitement of the moment was past, the king lamented that the realm was without a queen. The law of the Medes and Persians, however, precluded the possibility of the restoration of Vashti. Now there was in the city of Susa a fair young Jewess. Ahasuerus preferred her above all others, "so that he set the crown royal upon her head and made her queen instead of Vashti." She had been left an orphan when very young, by the death of both her parents, and the kindness of Mordecai, her uncle, secured for her the most careful and pious education. Little did the children of the captivity know how God was providing for their salvation, by

* There is a difference of opinion, relative to the reign under which the events related in the book of Esther occurred. Archbishop Usher says, that Darius Hystaspes was Ahasuerus. Prideaux agrees with Josephus, that he was Longimanus, while Scaliger and Kurtz call him Xerxes the Great. The account given (Esth. 1: 1,) of the extent of his empire would certainly point us to this reign rather than any other, while the follies recorded in Esth. 1 3-4-5, are remarkably characteristic of this inflated monarch.

the advancement of this orphaned maiden to the royal dignity of Asia. Haman was a proud vain-glorious man, who had gained unbounded influence over the mind of the king, and it had been decreed that all should bow and do him reverence when he passed. But Mordecai, who sat in the king's gate, probably deeming this reverence a sort of divine honor, refused to bow. Haman's wrath was kindled at this indignity. But "he thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone." His revenge could only be allayed by the total destruction of the tribe and nation of the man who refused to worship in his presence. By false accusations and untruthful statements to the king, concerning the Jews, he procured a decree calling for their assassination throughout all the provinces in a single day. Then was there weeping and wailing among the captive children of God, and then was Haman glad. But sometimes Satan will outwit himself. Haman was directing his fury against the very man to whom the king owed his life. Two of his chamberlains had conspired to assassinate him, but Mordecai revealed the plot, and they were put to death. For this service he had received no reward, until the king, reading the records, was reminded of his obligation, when he submitted to Haman the question, "What shall be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honor?" He quickly devised a mode of doing him honor which was well calculated to gratify a vain and foolish man, supposing that he himself was the person who was to receive the dignity. Who shall describe his mortification when he was compelled to act as servant to him whom his soul despised, even to Mordecai, wearing the king's crown, arrayed in the royal robes and riding on the steed that heretofore had carried none but the master of the world. In the mean time Esther, according to the instruction of Mordecai, and at the peril of her life, entered unbidden, the royal presence and revealed her kindred, the wickedness of Haman and the peril of her people. Then was Haman hanged upon the same gallows he had erected for Mordecai, and the latter was advanced to the prime ministry in his stead. The house of Haman was given to the queen to do with as she seemed proper, and although the decree for the destruction of the Jews could not be reversed, yet they were permitted to defend themselves, and were thus saved from destruction. In commemoration of this deliverance, they instituted a feast called Purim, on the fourteenth and fifteenth days of the month Adar, about the last of February, which they sacredly observe even at the present day.

ARTICLE IV.

THE BAPTISM OF CHILDREN OF PARENTS NOT IN CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH.*

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology, in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

IN this, as in all other discussions of disputed points, it is important to separate the things in which we agree from those on which we differ, or, in regard to which a decision is to be reached. Accordingly we assume as undisputed amongst us, (1) The propriety of baptizing some children, this being evident from the infant membership by circumcision on the eighth day enjoined in the *Old Testament* church: Gen. 17: 7, 9, 10: also as being exemplified in the practice of the Apostles to baptize entire families, in the case of Lydia, Acts 16: 15; of the jailor, Acts 16: 33; 1 Cor. 1: 15, 16; 1 Cor. 7: 14, and as being embraced in the generic language of the Savior's command, to make disciples of *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

(2) Further, it is agreed that the children of *professed believers* are proper subjects of baptism, according to the declaration of Peter to the Jews, "Repent and be baptized," &c., for "the promise is unto you and to your children," &c.

(3) It is conceded, finally, that if *only one* of the parents be a professed believer, that is, a member of the church in good standing, the child is to be baptized according to 1 Cor. 7: 14; that "the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were their children unclean; but now are they holy," that is, consecrated to God, and therefore entitled to the sign of this consecration, baptism.

The only question, therefore, before us, is, whether those children, neither of whose parents is a professed believer, that is, a member of the church, can consistently be admitted to this sacred ordinance.

When a question arises concerning a *positive* institution of our holy religion, that is, one whose obligation rests, not on

* This article was prepared as a report and presented at the late meeting of the West Pennsylvania Synod. Its publication, in the Evangelical Review, was requested by vote of the Synod.

the nature of things, but solely on the command of revelation, there are four sources, from which our arguments may be drawn, namely: the language of the command; the practice of the primitive church, guided by the inspired Apostles, and recorded in Scripture; the design for which the ordinance was appointed; and the practical influence of the several opinions and methods of practice resulting from them.

I. The preceptive language of the Savior is general: "Go ye therefore and make disciples (*μαθητευσατε*) of all nations (by) baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them," &c.: Matt. 28: 19. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," &c.: Mark 16: 16. As this language is general, it includes infants as well as adults. But whilst it demands *faith* as a preparatory qualification of adults, it leaves the relation of *faith* to the baptism of infants untouched, and to be decided by other proofs.

But the Apostle Peter tells the Jews, *Repent and be baptized*, &c., for the promise is unto you and to *your children*, &c.: therefore, as the baptism of children is based on the *Repentance and Faith* of their parents, these precepts of Scripture afford no ground for baptizing the children of those parents who have neither repentance nor faith; but it distinctly implies their exclusion from the rite.

II. Our next inquiry is, does the Apostolic example decide this point?

We reply, it undoubtedly does: for although several cases of family baptism are recorded in the New Testament, they are all families of believers, of persons who first made a profession of their faith themselves, and then received the ordinance of baptism: and not a single case is recorded, in which the family of an unbeliever was baptized, or in which any children were baptized, except in connection with the baptism of their parents.

In the instructions of the Apostle Paul, a specific case is adjudicated, which throws light on the question before us. When he teaches the Corinthians, that if even only one of the parents is a believer, be it the father or the mother, the children are entitled to baptism, to be regarded as holy, as consecrated to God: 1 Cor. 7: 14; this evidently implies that if neither of the parents is a believer, the children are "unclean," are excluded from God's consecrated people, and

not to receive baptism, which was the appointed rite by which this outward consecration was effected.

Had the Apostles believed it proper, or of any advantage, to baptize the children of unbelievers, without the security of religious education, they certainly acted most inconsistently, and neglected their obvious duty; for had that been their opinion, they ought to have baptized all the children within their reach, and exhorted parents to offer their children for baptism, even if they refused to be baptized themselves. But we hear of no such invitation to parents, and of not a single case of infant baptism, except in those instances in which the parent had been baptized first. The example of the Apostles is, therefore, decidedly opposed to the baptism of the children of non-professors.

III. Let us inquire whether the designs of the ordinance favor the baptism of children of unbelieving parents.

1) The first design is that of an *initiatory rite*, or badge of the *Christian profession*. The Scriptures annex the condition of repentance and faith as the prerequisite of baptism: "Repent and be baptized every one of you"—"Believe and be baptized," and "He that believeth and is baptized." As this rite is restricted to believers among *adults*, it may be regarded as essentially the appointed mode of *giving publicity to the repentance and faith* of the individual. And the baptism of his children gives still greater and continued publicity to his profession; as it publicly exhibits him in the performance of one of the peculiar duties of his profession.

But parents are the divinely constituted representatives of their children during their minority, and under obligation to train them in that profession and practice which they believe to be best. Now when a believing parent offers his child in baptism, he acts consistently, training the child, both by his precept and example, in the way in which it should go. An unbelieving parent, however, cannot act consistently in having his child baptized, but contradicts the principal, by promising to train him in a religion which he does not love or practice himself, and to pledge him to a course of life which his own practice neglects and his example condemns.

2) Another design of baptism, as Paul informs us, is to bind "the subject to walk in *newness of life*," Rom. 6: 4, and to "bind him to the answer of a good conscience," that is, to entire obedience to conscience, 1 Pet. 3: 21. Now the believing parent himself walks in this renewed life, and can

consistently dedicate his offspring to the same course, but an unbeliever does not do the former, and cannot perform the latter.

3) The third design may be as a badge of spiritual purification or conversion, or regeneration : "For by one (Holy) Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (the church,) we are all to be converted, to be spiritually baptized, whether we are bond or free, Jew or Gentile.—1 Cor. 12: 13. Hence, as baptism is a sign of professed spiritual regeneration in adult believers, it may justly be applied to their children also, as the pledge that they shall be brought under those influences which will tend to secure their conversion also. But it cannot be consistently applied to the children of unbelievers, as these children are not even in the way of being converted, because their parents reject that system of instrumentalities, by which alone the Spirit works this change.

Whether baptism may be extended to such children of unbelievers as are adopted by Christians into their families, and as may thus have a religious education secured to them, depends on the import of the declaration of the Apostle, "the promise is to you and to your children, and to as many as the Lord, your God shall call." If by children be meant lineal descendants, then they alone are admissible to baptism; but if the term also includes adopted children who are called, that is, brought under the influence of the Gospel institutions, then children of unbelievers which are adopted into the family of believers, may properly have this solemn rite administered to them. And as such are brought fully under these influences by baptism, we believe it proper to baptize them.

On the other hand, the baptism of the children of unbelievers, on the professed faith of mere sponsors, who do not take the children into their families, and cannot, therefore, bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, should, by no means, be practiced.

4) The fourth design of baptism is to bring its subjects under the *supervision and discipline of the church, and society of the brotherhood.* This design is applicable to the children of professed believers, because the supervision of the church members is secured, and will be of the utmost importance to them, and if they wander from the path of duty, they can be admonished, and, if need be, suspended and expelled, after they have reached years of maturity. But as these influences do not naturally reach the children of unbelievers, as they are not brought under the social influence of believers, nor

the discipline of the church, it is evident that the rite ought not to be applied to them.

5) As to the spiritual blessing, the nature of which is not defined in Scripture, but which always attends the performance of any commanded duty, it cannot be affirmed to apply to the children of unbelievers, because we do not regard their baptism as commanded in Scripture.

IV. Let us inquire into the practical influence of both methods on the prosperity of the church.

It is obvious that that method which God enjoined, will most favorably affect the church; and inversely, that the method which exerts the most salutary influence on the true prosperity of the church, must be the one enjoined in Scripture. Now it is evident that the indiscriminate baptism of all children, regardless of the scriptural limitation, tends to diminish the value of parental church membership, whilst the restricted practice enhances it. Believing members regard the privilege of having their children consecrated to God, not only as valuable, but also as a distinctive privilege of their Christian profession. But if non-professors enjoy the same privilege, then the peculiar value of Christianity is in so far obliterated. Again, as all parents naturally love their children, and desire them to possess every advantage, many parents, who neglect religion themselves, desire to have their children trained up under its instructions and ordinances. But if they are met by a scriptural barrier, and the inconsistency of their conduct is pressed upon them, they will often reflect on the propriety of the denial, and on their own guilt in neglecting that religion which they would secure to their children. Thus parental love is often the means of causing them to seek the favor of God, and the baptism of the child is preceded by the profession of the parents.

The lax practice of indiscriminate baptism, tends to foster the Romish superstition, that unbaptized infants, though redeemed by the blood of Christ, will be excluded from heaven for the neglect of their parents, a doctrine not only rejected by Luther, but inconsistent with the word of God and the principles of his moral government. But, on the other hand, the scriptural practice tends to inculcate the spirituality of the plan of salvation, the necessity of moral qualifications to an adult profession, and the advantages of that profession exhibited in peculiar privileges extended to their children, as the reward of parental faith.

Finally, the lax practice tends to lower the standard of piety among professing christians, and to destroy the distinction between the Church and the world. This influence is strikingly illustrated in the established churches of Europe, as well as in such portions of our country as practice indiscriminate baptism, where professed Christians cease to be a peculiar people, or to exert that salutary influence which the Savior characterized as "the salt of the earth," and "the light of the world."

ARTICLE V.

DOES JOHN, 3: 5 REFER TO BAPTISM?

By E. W. Krummacher.

Translated from the *Studien und Kritiken*.

THE passage is: "Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The Lord had said before to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily unless a man be born again (from above) he cannot see the kingdom of God." This declaration appeared absurd to Nicodemus, incomprehensible, impracticable, because he understood it (like the Capernaites, John 6: 22) carnally and literally and then the Lord uttered the words, John 3: 5, If then by being born of water, baptism was designed, use would not have been made of an obscure, and to Nicodemus unintelligible, representation. What prevented, if Baptism were intended, instead of the obscure "of water" the selection of "of Baptism?" But if it be admitted that the Lord meant by water Baptism, he certainly did not mean water baptism, much less infant baptism, because he connects "born of water with born of the Spirit," who is the sole author of spiritual life in us, for which reason he subjoins immediately, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." This is followed by additional elucidation of "from above." Marvel not, that I said unto you, ye must be born again, (Germ., from above.) "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of

the Spirit." It is to be observed, that the Lord, in what follows, drops the designation "born of water." Calvin says, on this passage, after rejecting various erroneous explanations, he proceeds: As regards the passage John 3: 5, I cannot persuade myself that Christ here speaks of Baptism, for this would not at all be reasonable. We must remember that Christ designed to exhort Nicodemus to a change of life, because he remained insensible to the Gospel, till he should begin to be a new man. He utters, therefore, the simple thought, that we must be born again, to become children of God, and that the author of the second birth is the Spirit of God. For as Nicodemus dreamed of a Pythagorean regeneration, Christ adds, to disabuse him of this error, the explanation, that it was not natural; a second physical birth, a new body was not necessary, but the birth consisted in a renewal of the mind and heart by the Spirit of God, that He used Spirit and water for one and the same thing, and that this ought not to be considered forced or unnatural. It is common in the Scriptures to set forth the power of the Spirit, to unite it with water and fire. Thus we read that it is Christ who baptizes with the Holy Spirit and fire, where the fire does not mean anything but the Spirit, but only shows what the power the Spirit in us is. The placing of water first in the passage does not amount to anything. This arrangement is preferable, because the figurative is followed by the plain and literal. Christ designs to say, no one is a child of God till he is renewed by water, but this water is the Spirit, who purifies us, and by his energy infuses into us the power of a heavenly life, as we are by nature entirely lifeless. Christ properly uses in this place this Scriptural mode of speaking, to expose the ignorance of Nicodemus. Thus was Nicodemus compelled to acknowledge that Christ's doctrine was accordant with the prophetic. Water is nothing but the symbol of internal purity and the quickening of the Holy Ghost. It is frequently the case, that the little word *and* (Water and Spirit) has an exegetical force, when for instance the following expression is an explanation of the former. The whole tenor of the discourse sustains this exegesis; for when Christ afterwards gives the reason for our being born again, he omits the water entirely and teaches that the new life which he requires, is of the Spirit alone, from which it results that water and Spirit coincide.

Beza holds similar language on the passage. He regards water as the symbol of the purifying and quickening power

of the Spirit and refers to Matt. 3: 11, where it is said of Christ that he will baptize with the Holy Ghost and fire. Here too, the expression fire is explained by Spirit, and his burning, destroying, warming and enlightening power is marked. He refers further to Acts 17: 25, where it is said, of God, that he giveth life and breath to every one. Here too ζωὴ καὶ πνοή are what elsewhere, viz: Gen. 2: 7, is called πνοὴ τῆς ζωῆς. Col. 2: 8, it is said, Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, i. e., by the empty deception of philosophy. Similarly, Matt. 4: 10, they sat in the region and shadow of death. He refers to Chrysostom, who in the 31st Homily says, the Holy Scriptures exhibit the grace of the Holy Spirit at one time, as water, at another, as fire, water purifies, fire cleanses, and removes dross. Eze. 36: 25, speaks of the cleansing power of the water of the Spirit, and Is. 11: 9, and Hab. 3: 14, compare the knowledge of God with water. In 1 John, 6: 9, the word water is used for the sanctity of Christian life, which united with martyrdom and miracles, testifies to the truth of the doctrine. Likewise the passage, John 7: 39, confirms this, that by water we are to understand the operations of the Holy Ghost. After the Lord had spoken of water, which he gave to the thirsty who came unto him, it is said expressly, that he said of the Spirit, whom they would receive, who believed on him. Eph. 5: 26 presents the cleansing with the washing of water by the word—evidently the cleansing power of the divine word. Titus 3: 5 speaks of the washing of regeneration. This has no reference to Baptism, least of all to infant baptism. The Apostle, including himself, speaks of the natural, unregenerate condition of man, and says: For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

Evidently the Apostle here speaks of himself and his fellow Christians who were snatched from their former corrupt and wretched condition, by the mercy of God, had now experienced a great internal change, and through the Holy Spirit

received the ability to be righteous and eternally happy. The expression "Washing of regeneration" is figurative, meaning washing away filth, the complement, the filling out of which is found in the positive designation, Renewing of the Holy Ghost. Granted that the apostolic words "Washing of regeneration" contained an allusion to holy Baptism, they would not, at all, support the doctrine that the baptism of infants effected a regeneration of the subjects; for there is no mention of children in the passage, but of adult and pardoned Christians, who assuredly in their baptism see a symbol, pledge, and seal of the willingness of the Triune God to save them. So it is with Rom. 6: 4; "We are buried with him by baptism into death." The entire context shows very clearly that Baptism is referred to but not infant, the baptism is that of adults who have been justified, whose old man has been crucified with Christ. Is recourse had to Gal. 3: 27, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ?" It only requires a hasty glance at the connection of this passage with the preceding, to attain the conviction that infant baptism is not remotely alluded to, but the reference is to the baptism of such Christians as are no longer under the law, but are real believers in Jesus Christ and thereby children of God.

ARTICLE VI.

EXPOSITION OF MATT. 11: 12.

"And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force."

By A. H. Lochman, D. D., York, Pa.

THIS scripture, with its parallel passage Luke 16: 16; "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it;" has for years appeared to me difficult to understand, and has been acknowledged so by eminent expositors of the sacred Scriptures.

The ordinary exposition of these passages has been: That from the days of John until Christ, there was such an intense

desire awakened in the minds of the people in regard to their eternal interests, that they rushed, with the ardor and impetuosity of those who would storm a city, to seek salvation through Jesus Christ, and that the Savior in these passages, designs to set forth the manner in which individual sinners must seek salvation.

Now this, almost universally accepted explanation appears to me, to be, in direct opposition to historic facts, to the allusion, to which reference is evidently had, to the context in which it is introduced and to the spirit of the passage so clearly indicated by the terms and phrases made use of in the original.

Moreover, the passage in its ordinary acceptation, has been most wofully perverted and made use of to favor the wildest and most extravagant outbreaks of fanaticism. All manner of bodily exercise, which profiteth little, violent measures must be used, high-wrought feelings excited, like those found with an infuriated soldiery in storming a city.

I know full well that even according to the ordinary acceptation, by most commentators it is made to denote an energy of the mind, a concentration of its powers and faculties upon the one thing needful, an earnest, upright, steadfast seeking of the Lord, and a self-sacrificing devotion to his service.

To such an explanation, so far as the abstract truth is concerned, we have no objection whatever, but that it is contained in and can fairly be deduced from the passage under consideration, we honestly doubt.

I am fully aware that it will be considered presumptuous for any one, at so late a day, to set himself in opposition to so many learned and good men, and to obtrude his opinion upon the Church; yet I "thought I will also show mine opinion." If by any thing I can advance, I may be able to throw light upon a passage, which perhaps to others as well as myself, has appeared dark and difficult to understand, I shall be sufficiently rewarded; if not, I trust that the attempt will not be attributed to any other motive than that which prompted it, viz: to aid in the exegetical exposition of the truth of God's word.

Having made these preliminary remarks, I will now give what I consider the sum of the passage, and sustain it by arguments which to my mind are satisfactory.

From the days of John until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, i. e., has been opposed, and the violent, the mighty, the great, men of influence and of evil passions as-

sail it by force, endeavor to crush it and destroy a religion so diametrically opposed to their wicked hearts and their ungodly lives.

In proof of this exposition I would remark :

1. That some of the best commentators agree that there is in these passages no allusion to the manner in which individuals seek salvation, and admit that the Savior merely states a fact which characterized the time intervening between the appearing of John and the date when he uttered the words of the text.—*Vide Barnes.*

2. That whilst the ordinary exposition is in direct opposition to historic facts, our view is in perfect harmony with them.

Though many were attracted by John's preaching, and crowds attended his ministry, there evidently appears to have been very little manifestation of that deep anxiety about their eternal salvation, which should characterize those pressing into the kingdom and certainly none of that bodily striving about religion, which many contend the passage implies. On the contrary, the mass opposed John and his doctrines, and especially the mighty, the noble and the great. It is expressly said 1 Cor. 1: 26, "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called." Jesus in speaking of the people of that day, says, "*Whereunto shall I liken this generation?*" and then adds of "John, they say he hath a devil" and of the Son of man, "Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber," and even after the Apostles were called the whole number of believers amounted to only one hundred and twenty.

These being the historic facts in the case the Savior could certainly not have intended to convey the idea of a striving for, but against his kingdom—not of striving, in a good, but evil sense; in the days referred to.

3. Again, the ordinary exposition is in opposition to the evident allusion to which reference is had, whilst our view is harmony with it.

There is no doubt but allusion is had to the manner in which cities or fortresses were taken and stormed. The besieging party rushed upon them with violence, with hearts filled with every evil passion, with hatred and revenge; maddened with lust for carnage and blood, they battered down the walls, slew and made captive the inhabitants. Now can any one, for a moment believe that the Savior would intimate

that with such feelings and passions, excited to the highest pitch, men should rush upon the kingdom of God and take it by force, or must we not (not to lose sight of the allusion) rather suppose that the Savior intended to set forth the malice and rage with which the enemies of his religion, set themselves against and assailed it by force, in order to crush and destroy it?

4. The context favors the view we have taken.

Viewing the passage in the sense, in which it is generally taken, I can see no connection whatever, either in the gospel by Matthew or by Luke. But in the view we have taken of it, we think an evident connection can be traced. In Matthew's Gospel, the Savior, in addressing the multitude, appeals to their own consciousness of having come to hear a prophet, in the person of John, and then tells them that such was indeed his character, that he was more than a prophet, even according to their own Scriptures, Mal. 3: 1. The messenger of the Messiah to prepare the way for his reception, and yet they opposed John and his message, and rejected both him and the Messiah, saying of one he hath a devil, and of the other he was a man gluttonous and a wine bibber, verse 18-19, and in the 17th verse he says, we have endeavored to gain you in every possible way and ye have resisted. "We have piped unto you and you have not danced, we have mourned unto you and ye have not lamented.

In Luke's Gospel the connection is equally if not more clear. In the 14th verse it is said, the Pharisees who heard all these things, derided, mocked and scorned him and the doctrines. Had John advanced, surely then they were not disposed to press into the kingdom and take it by violence. But he goes on (in 15th verse) and accuses them of endeavoring to justify themselves for so doing, by appealing to their law and the prophets, but Jesus tells them (verse 16) that their own law and prophets bore witness of John, and that since John commenced preaching the doctrines of his kingdom, and they had heard them, they still opposed him and remained in their sins, and that consequently they would be condemned by their own scriptures, for heaven and earth might pass away but not one tittle of the law should fail, (verse 17).

5. The ordinary exposition is opposed to the spirit of the passage so clearly indicated by the terms and phrases made use of in the original, whilst they clearly favor our interpretation.

The terms *Biārai* and *Biāz̄ai* both have an evil signification, and cannot be so construed as to convey a good intention. The former means violent, or mighty, or cruel, and the latter to use violence, cruelty, &c., yet to use all the energies of the mind to press into the kingdom of God would force us to put upon the signification of these words at least a good intention.

Moreover the verb is in the passive voice, the kingdom of heaven is the object against which this violence is directed, but if the common explanation were correct, then the kingdom of heaven would be the gainer and not the sufferer.

Thus I have given what I believe to be the correct exposition of the passage under consideration, and presented arguments, which appear to me, fully to sustain the view taken. If in error, I desire to be corrected, and if in any degree I have been able to throw light upon a passage which to others, as well as to myself, appeared dark and difficult, I have attained the object had in view in writing this brief article.

ARTICLE VII.

ENGLISH LUTHERAN HYMN BOOKS.

THE next attempt made at the preparation of our English Hymn book for the Lutheran Church, was that of the Rev. Paul Henkle, which was published at New Market, in Virginia, in the year 1816. Mr. Henkle is well known as the founder of that family which has exerted so marked an influence upon the character and development of the Lutheran church in the valley of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Tennessee and Ohio. He was undoubtedly a man of decided talent and originality of mind, though possessed of few advantages of education. He was first introduced into the church as a Catechist, about the year 1782, in connection with the United Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the adjacent States, and continued to labor with great zeal and success until an advanced period of his life. When he first commenced his labors as an author we are not informed, but we have before us a "*Catechism*" which he first published in the year 1811, and the title of "*The Christian Catechism*,"

to which is appended "Morning and Evening Prayers," "An explanation of Church Festivals, Sundays," &c., making all together nearly one hundred pages, 32mo. His command of the English language was by no means perfect, although he is possessed of a fluency remarkable in one who had acquired the English language, late in life. This is especially the fact in his original hymns, of which he has given us a very large number in his book, which contains some 347, the greatest part of which he appears to have written himself. Of the occasion of his preparing this book, he himself gives us the following statement in his Preface: "Dear Reader: I can assure you that it never was my intention to publish a book of this kind, until a few weeks before I began this work. A few years ago I was requested by my eldest son, Solomon Henkle, (who is by profession a Physician) to write the little book now in circulation, called the "Christian Catechism." * * * Great numbers of said Catechism were soon disposed off in this and other States, and continually more called for. My son having such success in disposing of said book, and in the same time finding that the few hymns which said Catechism contained; as morning and evening hymns, &c., were well approved of, he was thereby excited to request me to compose this book: which at first request I was much less intended than composing the above-mentioned Catechism, considering my many distant labors to which I was exposed; serving as an itinerant minister at the same time, rendered it a matter impossible in my view. But he being also encouraged by several of the ministers of the Gospel, of both North and South Carolina, who considered it a necessary performance, I was repeatedly solicited by him until I undertook the task, and performed, as you will see in the following pages."

The work was arranged according to the order of the Festivals and Sundays observed in the Lutheran Church, commencing with Advent, which is, however, preceded by six hymns for the opening and close of public worship. There is usually one hymn for the Gospel and another for the Epistle, making 151 until the end of the ecclesiastical year. Then follow hymns for Fast days and days of Thanksgiving, the litany and suffrages according to the form usual in the Episcopal Church, for the consecration of church officers and ministers, Baptism, Visitation of the sick, Death and Burials, Judgment, Heaven and Future Happiness; on the Lord's Prayer, Creation, Redemption, the Fall, Repentance, Faith, Prayer, Providence, the Word of God, for Civil Officers,

Meetings of Synods, for Prisoners, for Soldiers and Sailors, &c., &c. In a word there are over *ninety* rubrics, showing due regard to all the demands of Christian worship. To all this is added a version of the Psalms "by Dr. Watts and other authors," a proof of the readiness of the English Lutheran Church to avail itself of every improvement for this part of Divine services.

It is also worthy of note that all of Mr. Henkle's hymns are in the prevalent English metres, Long, Common and Short, and evidently upon the model of Watts, from whose hymns, however, we find here but few selections. Many of them are evidently translations from the German, yet without any attempt at preserving the original metres.

There were, however, two inseparable difficulties in Mr. Henkle's way, which prevented his success in this work: first, he was not sufficiently acquainted with the English language to insure even grammatical accuracy at all times; and secondly, he had no poetical genius. On both these points almost any of his hymns afforded sufficient evidence. Take, as an example, the following two verses which begin his first hymn:

"Here blessed Jesus we appear,
Thy sacred word of truth to hear;
Draw from this world our minds to thee,
And faithful *hearers* we shall be.

How wretched is our state of mind!
Our hearts how stupid, deaf and blind;
The way of life we do not know,
Nor have we pow'r therein to go."

The ninth hymn is even harsher :

We are by the Apostle taught,
And in his doctrine see,
How careful every christian ought
In all their lives to be.

The Gospel brings the truth to sight,
And spreads a bright display!
And ignorance like, as the night,
Thereby is drove away.

It is evident that a book abounding in such passages as these, even though at the same time containing many admirable hymns, could not permanently maintain a position as a book of devotion for intelligent and cultivated people. Hence

its use has naturally become more and more limited, and never, we believe, extended beyond the circle of Mr. Henkle's personal or family influence.

One thing is remarkable in regard to this collection, namely, that whilst it is based upon the most rigidly orthodox views of Lutheran doctrine, it has as its concluding hymn, just before the *Gloria Patri*, Pope's "*Universal Prayer*" — one of the most decided utterances of pure Deism.

"Father of all! in ev'ry age,
In ev'ry clime ador'd,
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove or Lord!"

It is evidence of the rapid progress which the Lutheran Church was making in the English language as well as in the evangelical sentiments, that these two books, that is to say, the New York Hymn Book, and this of Mr. Henkle could, not satisfy the demand in this direction for ten years. Even as early as 1825, the General Synod appointed a committee to prepare a hymn book that would more fully meet the wants and correspond to the ideas of the churches represented in it than either of these collections. The leading members of this committee (Drs. S. S. Schmucker and C. P. Krauth—both, at that time, among the younger pastors of the church), were undoubtedly the most suitable persons who could, at that time, have been selected for the work, and fairly represented the advancing position of the church united in the General Synod, both in literature and theology. In the Preface to their Hymn book (which first made its appearance in 1828) they very cautiously announce the grounds upon which those whom they represented desired a new hymn book: First, the New York Hymn Book, the general excellence of which they frankly admitted, did "not afford a sufficient variety for all the purposes of ministerial duty and Christian practice, and many of the choicest and most devotional productions of the English muse were not contained in it;" and secondly, "the General Synod deemed it their duty, in accordance with their constitution, and in obedience to the numerous calls made on them, to provide a hymn book, possessing alike sufficient amplitude, classical excellence and devotional spirit, to serve as a permanent book," etc. There is here no distinct mention of the great ground of complaint against the New York hymn book, viz: its want of a decided orthodoxy, unless we suppose this to be implied in "ministerial

duty and christian practice." We presume that they did not wish to disturb the church generally by the discussion of that question.

Yet the General Synod's Hymn Book is evidently based upon the New York Hymn Book. More than one half of the hymns (nearly 300 out of 520) contained in the latter are transferred to the former, with very little if any change. Nor was there any reason to complain of this, for, in the first place, these hymns were the common property of the public, being the productions of the most popular hymn writers in the English language, such as Cowper, Watts, Newton, Mrs. Steele, Toplady, the Wesleys, Doddridge, &c., and, in the second place, the Lutheran churches using the English language had now become accustomed to these hymns, some of which, as we have already seen, were in Dr. Kunze's book, the New York Book itself having also been extensively in use for the ten years preceding. The principle adopted by the committee of retaining all that they could from former collections was undoubtedly a sound one, and evinced correct judgment. There is nothing that becomes more endeared to us by use, than hymns which breathe the spirit of genuine devotion. All our holiest feelings, and many of our most delightful associations cluster around them. They are first commended to us by all the charms of music. Then we sing them in our families, or in delightful association with our dearest friends, "with whom we take sweet counsel and go to the house of God in company." Above all, our souls are thus lifted up to hold communion with our God and Savior, in prayer and praise. Hence we can readily understand the attachment not only of individuals, but of whole bodies of men, even to very poor hymns—to Tate, and Brady, and Rouse, and the productions of authors, by no means gifted with the divine spirit of poesy. Hence too, the horror expressed by so many, at alterations of favorite hymns, even when corrected in grammar, or sentiment, or taste. There can, therefore, be no doubt of the expediency of the course pursued by the General Synod's committee in retaining as many as possible, that is to say, all the best hymns of the New York collection.

It has, however, been recently objected that they also retained many hymns that had been altered in the interest of Socinianism or Unitarianism. That such alterations are highly objectionable, no lover of truth, and above all, of the heavenly truths involved in the Divinity of Christ, his medi-

atorial office, the sublime mystery of the Trinity, original sin and the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, will pretend to deny. But we do deny that either the General Synod's Hymn Book, or the committee which compiled it is responsible for any thing of the kind. They neither made these alterations nor did they knowingly endorse them after they had been made. They took them from an accredited collection, of whose literary justice and theological honesty they had no reason to doubt, and could not, therefore, feel under any necessity of consulting the original sources of the hymns, which they took therefrom, to see whether any material changes had been made in the sentiments of authors. All that they could be expected to investigate was the character of the hymns which they proposed to transfer to their new collection, in respect to their intrinsic truth and devotional character. With these no one has pretended to find fault. The fundamental orthodoxy of the General Synod's Book is admitted upon all hands. It is rather an objection to it that it takes too much of the form of a *systematic treatise on Theology*. Thus it commences with the evidences of Christianity—the authenticity and inspiration of "the Scriptures." Then comes "the being and attributes of God." Then we have "the Trinity," "the works and providence of God," "the fall and depravity of man." Then the person and work "of Christ," followed by the nature and operations of "the Holy Spirit," and so on through all the common places of theology. We can not say that we regard this as the best method of arranging a hymn book, but it certainly defends this book against anything like the idea of an intentional favoring of heterodoxy in the fundamentals of Christianity. It may, indeed, be a question as to what ought to be done in justice to the author and to the truth itself, after it has been discovered that any of the hymns in our book have been altered so as to prevent them from teaching that aspect of truth which they were at first designed to teach, but, in the mean time, until we conclude what is right and proper for us to do, we are comforted by the assurance that none of these hymns as they stand in our book inculcate false doctrine.

No one in fact, who is acquainted with the history of the times, and carefully examines the first edition of the General Synod's Hymn Book, can fail to notice that a strong reaction has here set in against the Rationalistic tendencies of the period (1800 to 1825). We have already noticed the distinct avowal of the doctrines of the Trinity in opposition to Uni-

tarianism, and of the Divinity of Christ, the fall and depravity of man and of a vicarious Atonement in opposition to Socinianism. Nor can we fail to recognize an improved evangelical tone and more fervid spirit of devotion in the book generally. There is also here more of the genuine Lutheran doctrine of *Justification by Faith*; and less parade of moral duties and legality than had before prevailed. For illustrations we refer to the hymns under the headings "Salvation through Jesus Christ," "Christian experience," and various others. There is also more reference in the rubrics to the peculiarities of public worship in the Lutheran church, its leading festivals, Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, &c., being distinctly mentioned. So also the Sacraments receive due attention and have hymns appropriated to them, that represent the spirit of the church, as well as could be expected in the existing state of this department of English literature and Theology.

This book was hailed with great satisfaction by the churches in connection with the General Synod and by many others, and very properly took rank with the best collections of the day, its compilers having availed themselves of the labors of their predecessors already mentioned, as also of Rippon, Dobell, and other standard English selections. But another ten years had not elapsed when a revision of the book was demanded by the voice of the church generally, and ordered by the General Synod, convened at Baltimore in 1841. The Hymn Book Committee were directed to "prepare a selection of a few additional hymns—and make such other improvements as will not materially interfere with its use in connection with the old editions." In pursuance of this plan the committee appear to have made very few changes in the body of the book, but added to it in the form of an "Appendix" about two hundred additional hymns. This appears to have been a very hasty work, and met with very little favor from the more intelligent portions of the church. The Lutheran church had now become more thoroughly Anglicised than ever before—the people were becoming more critical in the use of the English language, and the number of men thoroughly educated through the medium of the English language was greatly increased. Hence there was a strong demand for the removal of hymns of an inferior literary and poetical character from the book, especially such as violated the proprieties of the English language and good taste, and it was, doubtless

expected that those put in their places and appended to the work should manifest a decided advance in all these respects. That the new edition did not meet these expectations was manifest from the action of the General Synod, which met in Philadelphia in 1845, which appointed a special committee to inquire whether any other changes were called for in its Hymn Book, and if so, to report to its next meeting what they were and how they should be effected. The General Synod not meeting for three years, this Report was delayed until that period, and in the mean time the whole subject was very thoroughly canvassed not only in private, in the discussions of the committee, but also in Synods and in the public papers of the church. This prepared the way for a very full and animated discussion of the subject at the General Synod which convened in New York in May, 1848. The committee, (consisting of W. M. Reynolds, Charles F. Schaeffer, H. J. Schmidt, J. Few Smith and P. A. Strobel), presented a very elaborate report (covering six or eight pages in the printed Minutes of Synod, where it stands as Appendix C). In this they first discussed the general principles of Hymnology, and then apply them to the book before them. The conclusion at which they arrived was, that the General Synod's Hymn Book, as it then stood, "contained a large number of most excellent hymns, admirably adapted to the purposes of both public and private worship," but, was at the same time, "susceptible of improvement, had some blemishes, and might be made much more generally acceptable and useful." The latter part of this judgment they undertook to maintain by a distinct specification of the hymns to which they most seriously objected, and some particular illustrations of their meaning. They also stated in considerable detail the mode in which they proposed to improve the book generally.

After a very animated discussion, this report was adopted and the same committee, enlarged by the addition of one member from each Synod, not before represented in it, was "instructed to prepare the book in accordance with said report, not omitting more than fifty hymns and the duplicates from the old book, nor altering more stanzas of other hymns than is absolutely necessary." This gave the Appendix into the hands of the new committee without reserve, but imposed considerable restrictions upon them in regard to the remainder of the book. It is this revision which is now before us, and upon which we venture to offer a few remarks.

This Book contains over one thousand hymns (1,024)—in-

cluding over twenty doxologies, and should, therefore, contain a full representation of this department of sacred literature. That it contains a large proportion of the best hymns that had made their appearance in the English language at the time of its publication, we are very well satisfied. All the standard American and English collections were examined with a view to its improvement, and many hymns were gathered from various other sources. Cowper, Newton, Watts, the Wesleys and all the most popular collections, as already indicated, had been carefully examined for the original work. To these were now added the full collection of Montgomery's Hymns, together with the new Presbyterian, Baptist and Methodist collections, as well as some made for the Episcopal church in England and America. It is evidence of their standard character, that we find Mr. Beecher incorporating at least one half of these hymns with his "Plymoth collection," which undoubtedly represents the latest results which have been reached in the composition and collection of hymns.

But with all this, we cannot regard our collection as, by any means, perfect, or as having reached a position with which we may rest satisfied. Our main objections to it are two, first, that it contains a number of hymns that should not be in it, and, secondly, that it does not contain a number that we should be glad to hear sung in our churches as well as in our private devotions. In elucidation of the first point we remark, that we do not by this, design to find fault with either of the General Synod's committees for inserting such hymns. The first committee, doubtless, did the best that was to be done in that day, and the second committee was restricted by the terms of their appointment to the removal of fifty hymns from the original work. In this also the General Synod may have been justifiable at the time, first, by the impolicy of making too great alterations in its book, so as to render its use in churches inconvenient, and secondly, by the deficiency of superior hymns at that time. But it is undeniable that many of these hymns are of a very inferior character. Some of them have scarcely a single element of poetry in them, others are marred by decided inelegancies, and many are liable to special objections. Thus, such hymns as Nos. 554, 563, 581, 542, 511, 325, 262, 92, 645, 589, 674, and various others have no literary merit whatever, and no other peculiar excellence to commend them to a place in a book of public devotion. They are essentially prosaic, and common place in all respects. Why should we retain such hymns in our book

to the exclusion of others so much superior, and the want of which is so often felt by our ministers when they seek for hymns appropriate to the ideas and emotions awakened by their sermons or the circumstances, in which they are placed? All men of taste and judgment feel that every celebration of public worship should be one complete whole, unmarred by any heterogeneous or disturbing element—that the sermon, prayers and hymns should mutually support and enforce each other. A rich variety of suitable hymns is, therefore, absolutely necessary for every congregation that would have public worship in its most perfect form, and for every minister who aims at the highest possible edification of the flock which he feeds.

There is also in this book a large number of hymns which although passable, have no decided merit, and might well give place to others of a more positive character which have recently, or since the compilation of this book, commended themselves to the affections of all who have become acquainted with them.

Of the special objection to particular hymns we shall not here say anything, as it would extend these remarks too far, and might also tend to disturb the devotions of some who may still be edified by hymns or verses which it is out of the power of others to use in accordance with the Apostle's direction : "I will sing with the *spirit*, and I will sing with the *understanding* also."

We shall here be asked, whether it is our design to advocate the reconstruction of the General Synod's Hymn Book, or to urge that body to prepare a new book? We answer both branches of this inquiry in the *negative*. We do not believe that our churches are prepared for such a movement, nor do we think that all the materials that are necessary to make it successful, are yet accessible. But when we say this, we, by no means coincide with the position taken by one of the members of the late General Synod in Pittsburg, who declared, upon the floor of that body, that he should resist all attempts to change our hymn book, giving therefor various inconclusive reasons. When the *edification* of the church calls for a change, this fact will, to our mind, outweigh all considerations of inconvenience in finding a hymn, or in using different editions of a hymn book, and even that terrible evil of expending a few dollars in the purchase of *new books*, as though this would bankrupt the church, or produce a rebellion paralleled only by the British Stamp Act of 1775! But we do not advocate

any radical change just now, because we do not think that the time for it has yet come.

One thing, however, we are prepared to recommend, and that is, that the hymns in the Appendix be thrown into their appropriate places in the body of the book. This might at once relieve the book of a number of inferior hymns that are never used, at least not by persons of any taste or judgment, make the use of the book more convenient, and somewhat reduce its size. This would neither destroy the older editions, nor make their use troublesome, as the old numbers could be given with every hymn the position of which was changed, and an ordinary exercise of care would prevent confusion as well in the prayer-meeting as in church. These are our deliberate opinions in regard to the present form of the General Synod's Hymn Book, and we hope that they will not disturb the nerves of any of our brethren, especially such as claim to be pre-eminently "*progressive Lutherans*."

There is still another English Lutheran hymn book—that, namely, of the "Joint Synod of Ohio." This work was first published at Zanesville, Ohio, in the year 1845. It was based, essentially, upon the General Synod's Book, which had been extensively used in the churches for whom this book was prepared, but also contained many hymns from other sources, especially the New York and Episcopal collections. We can not speak very highly of the taste or judgment displayed in this work, and regard it as creditable to the ministers and people of that part of the church for which it was prepared that a second edition was never called for, and that before the expiration of ten years from its appearance they demanded an entirely "new collection of hymns without special reference to any particular hymn book now in use. This made its appearance in 1854 or 1855, under the title of "*Collection of Hymns for public and private worship*. Published by order of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio. Columbus." The objects and plan of this work are thus indicated in its Preface: "The [several Synods of Ohio] felt unwilling, for various reasons, to introduce the General Synod's collection of hymns * * * The materials employed in this work were derived, to a considerable extent, from the principal collections used by different denominations, and largely from various other sources. It will be seen that many of the best hymns now in use are embodied in this book, and that a considerable number of hymns are translated from the German, several of them being versions of Lu-

ther's own vigorous productions. The committee availed themselves of the best translations they could find; in some cases they ventured to prepare new versions themselves, and occasionally they introduced later hymns from distinguished authors which had not yet appeared in any collection. A few original productions were also added." "It is thought that this book will, in some measure, satisfy the existing want, although the committee feel constrained to acknowledge that with more time and a better field to select from, than our rather barren English Hymnology, their work could have been much improved, and brought into closer conformity with the peculiar wants of the Lutheran church."

This work is undoubtedly an improvement upon the old Ohio hymn book, but candor compels us to say that it ranks very low as an artistic production. The great body of its hymns is, indeed, taken from the General Synod's Hymn Book, but we do not think that the selection has been made with the care and taste that might have been exercised. Thus under the head of "*Confirmation*" which has so special an interest in the Lutheran Church, some of the best of the General Synod's hymns have been neglected and others without any special merit taken. For example, we miss the hymn commencing, "*O happy day that fixed my choice,*" So also the hymn, "Now I resolve with all *my heart*" is omitted without any adequate substitute. On the contrary the hymn, "Lord I am thine, entirely thine" is retained, although it has several very defective stanzas which might very well have been spared. Among the new selections also, we find a considerable number of hymns without any peculiar excellence to recommend them. As such we might specify Nos. 29, 52, 71, &c.

But the great defects of the book are its want of a truly poetical spirit, and of purely idiomatic English. This is observable throughout the work in general, but especially in its translations from the German. No one will suspect us of a disposition to find fault, or of unnecessary particularity in this direction. On the contrary, we most deeply sympathize with the compilers of this work in their desire to transfer to our English church the rich treasures of German Psalmody. But we regard many of the translations incorporated into this book as a very serious obstacle in the way of such an undertaking. Many of them are utterly destitute of all poetical spirit and not a few violate some of the most obvious idioms and proprieties of English expression. We forbear from

corroborating this opinion by citations, because we have no disposition to hurt the feelings of those, whose good intentions we so highly appreciate. We merely suggest that the committee were too good-natured in accepting of whatever was presented to them by brethren, whose vocation does not lie in the direction of poetry, nor even of rhyming—at least in English.

On the other hand we recognize with pleasure many excellent hymns, both select and original, in this collection, and occasionally also a fine translation that has not appeared elsewhere. Among the former we only specify that very sweet hymn commencing "Just as I am without one plea" which is beginning to take its place in every standard collection of hymns. We also recognize several hymns from the pen of the Rev. M. Loy, of Delaware, Ohio, as possessing very decided merit, Nos. 239 and 240 have both some very fine points in them. The latter is "Prayer in affliction" and has the following as its opening and closing stanzas:

"I thank thee Savior! for the grief,
Thy goodness bids me bear,
And for each word of sweet relief,
That saves me from despair.

2 I see but dimly all thy ways,
Nor may each purpose tell,
But this I know to wake my praise,
Thou doest all things well.

6 To me, O Lord! thy grace impart,
Each trial to abide,
And ever let my bleeding heart
Cling to thy bleeding side.

We suspect that there is some typographical error in the third stanza which commences "And pleasure draws me to the earth"—at least we do not see its connection with the preceding stanza. Mr. Loy's hymns on the Lord's Supper, (Nos. 222 and 223) also possess very decided merit, but are rather too didactic for genuine poetry. No. 224 is harsh and prosaic, especially the last stanza. His translation of Selnecker's "*Lass mich dein sein und bleiben,*" is very good, commencing thus :

"Let me be thine forever,
My gracious God and Lord,

May I forsake thee never,
Nor wander from thy word.
Preserve me from the mazes
Of error and distrust,
And I shall sing thy praises
Forever with the just."

Mr. Loy is yet young enough to improve, we therefore hope that he will devote himself with earnestness to this work, and that he may furnish the church with what she so much needs—a great addition to her hymns, for which we naturally look, in the first place, to the rich and exhaustless mine of her German hymns, and in the next, to the spirit of her faithful children who have drunk at this holy Helicon. That this work will yet be done we have full faith, and only regret that our Ohio brethren have not given it a stronger impulse. Nor do we doubt that in a future revision of their book, should they ever make it, they will find abundant materials with which to replace many imperfect translations which they have here given us. Much of this matter is, in fact, already at hand, and only requires to be known in order that it may be properly appreciated.

ARTICLE VIII.

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS.

No. XI.

Delivered to the Graduating Class, consisting of Messrs. John W. Miller, Matthias Miller, Sylvanus Sheimer and Jesse Stocker, at the annual Commencement, in 1845.

It is undeniable that, in this world in which God has placed us his rational creatures for a brief period, influences both good and evil are exerted upon us, and that those that are evil, operating upon minds predisposed to do wrong more readily than the good, effect their end.

On this account every human being may be considered as incurring great risk, as embarked in a voyage liable to dangerous shipwrecks and perfect ruin. The experienced in life's dangerous vicissitudes, animated by love of their kind, offer their friendly counsel to those who, unacquainted with the perils, are prosecuting their onward course. The peculiar

solicitude and the most earnest admonition are needed by those who, in the morning of life, are just about, or ere long will commence, released from tutelage, to pass over the stormy regions of man's terrestrial habitation. Addressing myself, by the proprieties of the occasion, to such at this time, I make my theme the dangers to which the young are exposed. Listen, then, you who are encompassed with many dangers, and learn how you may guard yourselves against them. You are, in the first place, in danger of overrating your mental endowments.

Inordinate self-love is a prominent characteristic of fallen humanity. Stimulated by this, whatever pertains to us and is regarded as contributing to our honor is easily valued disproportionately. Mental endowments, confessedly the highest of our Creator's gifts to us, when the attention is directed to them, and they are considered as the glory of man, are rarely, perhaps, measured judiciously, and in very many instances, are supposed to exist in a very extraordinary degree, when the evidence is very small, and insufficient to convince any other than the interested judge. Such a result is often aided by the partiality of relatives and friends, whose commendations are extravagant. It is aided by our ignorance of the capacity of others. It is aided by a low standard of comparison.

It may, indeed, be unable to claim for itself the dignity of a conclusion from any *data* adequate, or inadequate, and may be the baseless fancy of a heart too strongly persuaded of its own great powers, to ask any other proof than its own intuitions. It may be thought, that in all this there is little that is formidable, and no admonitory voice is needed to guard against it. An over-estimate of one's abilities is a common occurrence and threatens no great calamity. It is true that it ought not to be regarded as the heaviest misfortune that can fall on a human being. It may often rather excite laughter than create alarm. The judicious physician may look upon it as a mild affection, demanding no severe remedial appliances, but entirely within the competency of the powers of nature (*vis medicatrix naturae*) entirely to remove it. Larger experience, and increasing knowledge often furnish the antidote and the temporary delusion departs, leaving the mind so little injured that its recuperative elasticity speedily replaces it in its proper position. It may, however, retain its hold with greater firmness, and gathering strength in

time, rear a formidable front, and throw out venom of a very deleterious character.

To guard against it is proper and conducive to our good. Should this not be done, vanity and pride take up their abode in us. Both are feelings calculated, neither to add to our respectability, nor our happiness—the vain man believeth a lie. The proud man desires that all who have intercourse with him should believe a lie. The vain man's heart riseth in exultation, not because his mind is a beautiful edifice, but because he fancies it to be. The proud man's heart swells because he supposes himself, whilst he is not, entitled to a high degree of respect from his fellow man.

As the proximate cause of such mental delusions, constituting serious blemishes in the character of any rational being, an over estimate of our intellectual endowments is earnestly to be eschewed. The various ways, in which vanity and pride interfere with true enjoyment, the serious hindrances that they cause to a proper development of our moral natures, are well understood. They are the root of much evil, and though not vices whose names produce in us great horror, they are the source of a vast number of those other moral delinquencies which infatuated man fastens upon him, and the bitter consequences of which he experiences in time and eternity. Seek then not to underrate, because this may exert a chilling influence upon your opening enthusiasm, but carefully avoid a thinking of the faculties of your mind, your capacity to comprehend, to retain and to apply truth more highly than you ought to think.

Closely allied to this is an over estimate of our attainments. This is the second danger which we point out to you. In the acquisition of knowledge, the mind is highly gratified with its own achievements. Knowledge is pleasant to the soul. It is a treasure of inestimable value. Compared with gold, or any merely temporal possessions, it is not easy to overrate it. Happy is the man whose mind is well stored with it ! The most honored names in the world's history are those associated with extensive literary and scientific acquisitions. It is natural for man, as his consciousness surveys large intellectual accumulations in the repositories of his own mind to feel kindling within him delightful emotions, and to rejoice that he has not toiled in vain. But there is danger lest the shout of joy should go forth before we have reached the goal. Aided by the same powerful affection, self-love, which performs so important a part in our mental economy, it is not very difficult

for us, particularly when we have but slender materials for it, to convince ourselves that in us has appeared a prodigy of learning, a real Polyhistor. It is exceedingly easy to make very great blunders on this subject. A smattering of knowledge often appears a vast amount, and the rudiments of learning are mistaken for its perfection. Prepared to prosecute slowly certain branches of human knowledge, it is supposed that we have already mastered them.

It may be thought that such a state of things cannot be followed by any evil consequence, but it is full of inauspicious foreboding. As productive of indolence, and keeping back the mind from proper efforts in the pursuit of knowledge, it operates very injuriously. The love of knowledge with the feeling that little has been done in the attainment of it, is the proper stand-point for every man, particularly for the young. The modest scholar, charmed with his appropriate vocation, the mastery of knowledge, promises every thing that human powers can accomplish. He who says to himself "My work is done" sits down in idleness and makes no effort. For what should he toil? Why should he not repose? There is nothing for him to do, or so little comparatively that he need not exert himself. He can wait till those lagging behind shall be able to overtake him, and a single bound will suffice to place him far in advance of them. Such a state of things must be viewed with great pain by a true philanthropy. It did not exist with them who have rendered themselves the ornament of our race by their extensive conquests in the domain of truth. No brilliancy of parts, no strength of reason will suffice for high eminence in the walks of learning without diligence, that *improbus labor*, "which alone moves forth in the majesty of victory. The evils then are great. It is certainly the duty of man during the whole of life to be active in the pursuit and application of truth. He has work sufficient to employ all his time and all his powers. Properly estimated, he will find it not below but beyond his strength, and often have occasion to lament that of the great mass, he can make his own so little. It has often happened, it will happen again, it will happen in your case, unless you are exceedingly watchful, that the promises of fine talents, respectable attainments and favorable opportunities have been entirely frustrated by an overweening reliance on intellectual strength and attainments. Thus has education fallen short of the prize and discredit been awarded to the advocates of it. The autodidactic with less self-reliance, and with a due

appreciation of his own emptiness, by persevering effort has made larger literary replenishments and shown the poverty which has been the issue of the large capital with which the educated have commenced operations.

We pass on to a third danger to which the young are exposed, it is an undue reliance on their moral firmness. It is soon seen by every one that there are vices of a hateful and injurious character to which we are exposed, and particularly in the earlier periods of our career. Escaping for a time, we become more safe, and in the progress of life may be considered as well fortified against them. A proper consideration of the power of temptation, and the weakness of man should ever preserve within us a feeling of distrust and induce us to be cautious. Where exposure to temptation can be avoided, it is better not to incur it. Whatever may be our strength, it should never be tried in unnecessary encounters.

The very fact that we are testing our moral power with sought enemies, tends to diminish it. If it derives any vigor from the throne of God, it must falter when summoned to action without the approbation of our hearts.

Neither reason, nor religion allows us to test our power of resisting evil, when the occurrences of life do not demand it. In this field of labor, abundant employment is afforded every one. It is then entirely supererogatory for him to endeavor to add to the amount. Temptations are no doubt useful, and constitute a part of our probation, the issues of which, if they are properly met, will, in the development of virtue and virtuous habits, fit us for efficient agency in whatever sphere of God's dominions our home may be assigned us. When they come, and come they will in number and power, sufficient for every one who is not exceedingly unreasonable, they should be met, and extinguished. Our vocation does not urge us to sally forth in quest of them. They are around us and in us, perpetually active, never ceasing, calling for continual vigilance and persevering resistance. In the conflicts of life before we have become experimentally acquainted with them, we may easily err by magnifying our own prowess, and indulging contempt for the foe. The young, the ardent, the inexperienced, ignorant alike of their own hearts and the insidiousness of vice, may readily anticipate results in spiritual contests, which will never be realized on the arena of conflict. It is easy, it is common for the young to believe themselves the depository of formidable power, which employed against the enemies of virtue will not fail of victory. This confidence

is neither authorized nor indicative of good. It has no sufficient basis. It cannot be viewed with approbation. It is calculated to awaken apprehension. It produces fool-hardiness. It throws us into the *melee*, without the requisite defenses, and exposes us to the strokes of the foe with an uncovered head. Is it wise for us to weaken ourselves and strengthen the enemy? Should we give him any undue advantage over us? As good soldiers, should our preparation not only be good, but the very best? Should we not make assurance doubly sure? Should we not be ready, not only to escape, but to demolish, if possible, the enemy? Should it not be seen, that from us there is no hope? Nothing is more certain than that whatever may be the temptation, to which we are exposed, the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye, or the pride of life—whether it be licentiousness, or avarice or intemperance, or all, and youthful lusts may be regarded as comprehensive of all, or the temptations to which they are exposed, may be regarded as coming from these sources, nothing is more certain than that the security against them finds no assistance in any fancied facility with which we can repel them. Guard well then against this danger! Study your own hearts! Look at the world! Ask why that young man has become intemperate or licentious. Did he intend to be found in this frightful position? Did he anticipate that the odious names, which designate such, would be applied to him? Few have seen in advance to what they have come. Did they behold the danger and prepare themselves for it? Or did they, apprehending no danger, and confident in their own strength, fall, both because they overrated their strength and underrated that of the enemy. How admirable the advice of the Hebrew sage: "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." "Hear him again: "With her much fair speech, she causeth him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him. He goeth after her straightway, as an ox goeth to the slaughter, or as a fool to the correction of the stocks; like a dart stricken through his liver; as a bird hasteth to the snare, and knoweth not that it is for his life. Hearken unto me now therefore, O ye children, and attend to the words of my mouth. Let not thine heart decline to her ways, go not astray to her paths. For she hath cast down many wounded, yea, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death."

I am convinced, that licentiousness and intemperance would number fewer, many fewer victims, if the young had apprehended danger, regarded themselves as not proof against temptation, seen that by insidious movements vice creeps into the heart, and whilst it beclouds the judgment carries captive the soul. That young man carries with him a charmed life, fitted to despoil temptation of its poison, who inflated with no high notions of his irresistible power, takes along with him an eye glancing around for mischief and a courage prepared energetically to attack it. It is not cowardice that we recommend; we ask for courage, intelligent fortitude. We do not teach you to cower before the tempter. We ask you to meet him manfully, to resist him with whatever power you may be enabled to employ. We promise you success, if distrusting yourselves, you look for help to Him who is mightier than all our foes, to that God who suffereth us not to be tempted beyond our power, and who with the temptation maketh a way for our escape. Armed with truth and the grace of God, no weapon formed against you can prosper. Powerful may be your adversaries, they may not be, they are not merely flesh and blood, but principalities, powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, spiritual wickedness in high places, it matters not—they cannot triumph over the careful, the watchful and the good. With whatever of plausibility they may seek to win, a latent fallacy is contained in every thing they say. It is by misrepresentation and lies, that they seek the mastery, and would rule over our spirits by perversions of the truth. The odiousness, the wretchedness, the guilt, the fearful retrIBUTIONS of vice in the disgrace, the punishments, the remorse, the horrible forebodings of this world, the loss and eternal perdition of another, are the powerful counteractives furnished us by the God of Providence and Grace to shield against the incursions of evil. We need fortitude to resist these, characterized thus, "a proper conduct in regard to the difficulties and dangers of life, so as neither to betray ourselves by unreasonable fear, nor rashly to put ourselves in the way of evil. It is by the self-command, which proceeds from it, that we can prepare to meet the evils which threaten us at a distance, and it is the same virtue that keeps the mind from sinking under present and unavoidable calamities, and animates it to endure, with patience and resignation, to the will of God, what it can neither control nor remove. It is closely connected with self-control, without a considerable share of which none can be eminently good or great."

We mention the fourth danger to which you are exposed. It arises from a desire implanted in our nature by the Wise Author of our being, intended for good, and doubtless an important sources of human happiness. It is the desire of society. How this propensity operates and what is its strength I need not say. It dwells in every bosom and its power is felt every day. The indulgence of it imparts joy to our life. Deprived of opportunity of intercourse with those, bound to us by the ties of identity of nature, we suffer in body and mind. In such privation, the mind seeks for companionship in anything animated, which may be near it; the meanest animal, the smallest insect can attract and interest it. How eagerly do they pant to return to the haunts of men whose crimes have made them dangerous to society, and who have been separated from it by the just, yet painful sentence of the law for a limited period or forever! Without something to divert them from the loneliness of their condition, something to act as a substitute for converse with their kind, the equipoise of the mind would speedily be destroyed, and the lost to virtue would become lost to reason. The society of our fellow creatures is to us highly important. We cannot forego it without serious injury. Monasticism and solitariness are unnatural. They are the effects of fanaticism or misanthropy. Seeking then from the contact of mind with mind admissions to our ideas and to our agreeable emotions, imparting and receiving good for good, associating with one another, and exercising a reciprocity of giving and receiving through the mighty instrument by which man, gifted man, in this, far in advance of the whole creation of God immediately known to him, transfuses himself into others, and receives them into himself, so that with a wonderful elective affinity, they are united with each other, and the properties of one become the properties of all, we are doing right. ¶ The Author of our constitution has not gifted us with speech, made us speaking animals in vain. The wonderful construction of the human tongue and the other organs for the modification of sound, the capacity of associating vocables and ideas, and at our will embodying the one in the other, plainly point out to us, with our social propensities, that intercourse with one another, through conversation, was intended to subserve important purposes in reference to our well being.

But this very propensity which is so admirably furnished with an apparatus adapted to render it efficient, and to which a vast amount of blessedness is certainly to be ascribed, may

be diverted from its legitimate purpose and be made the cause of great evil. Too great fondness for society is not compatible with that meditation and study which are so necessary for us. Fondness for society and this is one of the dangers of the young, for society which cannot profit us, is seriously injurious. Not only as consumptive of time without any profit, but mainly because it exerts a prejudicial influence on the mind. It tends to unfix, to disintegrate, to enfeeble. It scatters and prostrates it, rendering it difficult to marshal and restore it.

The great danger is a fondness for the companionship of the wicked. Here is the fruitful source of untold sorrows. How often do we find dangerous principles, and corrupt practices associated with fascinating manners and fine attainments. These are the demons who, in the service of a great captain, perform feats of wickedness that do honor to Pandemonium. It is a feature of moral depravity to aim at propagation. It seeks to diffuse itself. Like leaven, it tends to leaven the whole mass. The atmosphere around the profligate is tainted, it is charged with *malaria* which cannot be breathed with impunity. If any escape, they escape as by fire. Many perish. They are drawn into the vortex, whirled around for a brief period, and then are plunged into the eternal abyss. So have we known young men, the joy of their parents, the hope of their friends and the pride of their instructors, not unaffected by the claims of religion, and attentive to the motions of a well-instructed conscience, brought into the society of the reckless and the abandoned, and all these fair hopes and brilliant promises have faded, and lamentation and woe have followed. Most true is it, and often has it been illustrated in times past and in our day, that a companion of fools shall be destroyed. "Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not into the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away. For they sleep not, except they have done mischief, and their sleep is taken away, unless they cause some to fall." How important the advice, how well drawn the picture! They are the words of a wise man, of large experience and taught of God to utter truth, bearing the broad seal of the upper sanctuary. Sometimes it appears difficult for us to keep out of the way of danger; ere we are prepared for it, the Philistines seem to be upon us, but in this greatest of dangers, it is more easy for us to be on our guard. Does vice approach us clad in garments of light? It will soon show itself in its true colors. Then is the

period for action. Withdraw from it. We know that evil communications corrupt good manners, we need not tamper with them, but should at once withdraw. If we heard the cry of mad dog, and saw the infuriated animal, we would remove from its path, if we knew a locality to be charged with the elements of a certain death, we would keep away from it. So should we stand aloof from the friends of vice and escape the toils of the hunters of souls.

How anxious is the heart of the friends of youth, when they see them surrendering themselves to the influence of the bad, how sad their forebodings, and how sure the result! How would we raise our loudest tones, how would we utter our intensest admonitions, how would we supplicate and entreat by every thing holy and good, the young to fly the path of the destroyer. "Beware," said Jesus Christ, "of men!" "Beware of bad men! Trust them not. Dwell not with them. Shun and avoid them. Make them feel that you can have no fellowship with them. Let them know that you dread them. Let them see that you pity them. Let them know, that you believe their way is dark and leads to hell. Strengthen yourselves by the society of the good, by intercourse with the virtuous, by communion with God." Emancipated thus from imminent danger, you will not guide others in the downward path, and the blood of souls, murdered souls, will not be in your skirts.

Another danger to which you are exposed may be said to be mistaking the limits of the passions and your power of control over them. An important part of our nature is the sentient. Without it we should be essentially different from what we are. The motive power of humanity would be wanting. Torpidity would be substituted for the activity which everywhere manifests itself. The happiness of man would be greatly diminished. All the phenomena of this part of our constitution are important, when displayed within proper limits. In the exercise of feelings there is a defect, there is an excess, which may be equally criminal, there is a medium which is virtuous. The passions of the human heart are under various influences which we need not analyze, irregular, inflammable and exceedingly prone to excess. Their excitants are so numerous and powerful, and their excitability is so great that it is very easy to have them brought into intense and powerful action. Acquainted, to some extent, with the circumstances under which they are called forth, considering

them as more or less beyond the immediate control of volition, the opinion is readily embraced that the region of passion is a stormy one, over which we have no control. Such are often the deductions of the young from a superficial philosophy. Ready are they to persuade themselves that if they expel nature with a fork, she will nevertheless return. It is not for man to set himself against the decrees of God, and to endeavor to bring out results counteractive of his obvious purposes. He has fitted us up with excitabilities, he has prepared corresponding stimulants, he has connected certain consequences with the influence of the one upon the other, and what are we that we should resist God? Can we stay his hand? Can we subvert our nature? Thus do the young theorize, and form captivating arguments, by which they are convinced that they are slaves of their passions and their appetites, that they cannot control, much less escape from their power. The practical conclusion from the whole is, that whatever is done in obedience to the solicitation of passion is complying with irreversible laws of our nature, and may be regarded as fulfilling the will of God. To such frightful consequences are we conducted, when we undertake to apologize for, or to justify the inordinate indulgence of passion. It is here that immense evil is produced, and bitter must be the fruits of such forms of speculation. Fairly interpreted, it meaneth that there is no vice in the world. All evil has its origin in disordered affections and unrestrained passions. If then there is no controlling energy within us, if we are necessarily carried along by the power of circumstances, if when we are tempted, we are tempted of God, moral distinctions cease, virtue and vice are names, punitive justice is a farce, and the retributions of eternity are the veriest bug bears! Nothing is truer than that the regulation of the passions is within our control, that we are capable of restraining them, within the limits prescribed by virtue and approved by conscience. Against an opposite sentiment we have the verdict of the world, and of God. Apologies then for sin, the representation of them as weakness, the attempt to excuse them on whatever basis and no less on the basis of the strength of temptation and the weakness of man, are entirely to be discarded, and to be classed amongst the powerful machinery employed by the arch-fiend to batter down the fortresses of our virtue, and to drag us down to perdition. Study the philosophy of the human mind, learn how our feelings are waked up and rendered ac-

tive, make yourselves acquainted with the appliances by which they are curbed and repressed within their proper bounds, arm yourself with the moral verities of the Bible, and conscientiously use all the means, which God has afforded you to render you the rulers of your own spirits, and you will never stand forth the advocates of vice and the panders of iniquity, you will never shock your own moral sense, or that of your fellow man, by supporting a theory of the lawlessness of passion subversive of that law whose "seat is in the bosom of God and whose voice is the harmony of the universe." You will, in this way, show that man can govern himself, that intellect and reason are superior to feeling, and that man is free, in a word, that when any one is tempted, he is not tempted of God, but that he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed, and that the very passions which he cherished by his excuses for him, will punish him frightfully for what he has done.

Another danger of a serious character to which the young are exposed is being too much influenced by authority on the subject of religion. The religion of the Bible presents itself to us under the imposing character of a revelation from God. It is not proposed that we should receive it and use it as an inspired communication, without entire conviction that its pretensions are well founded. We are capable of determining its claims, of sitting in judgment upon its worth as an accredited document from God, and of deciding upon its merits. It is the duty of every young man to know, if it can be known, and we believe that it can, that it is not a cunningly devised fable, that it has sustained itself thus far by the force of truth, and that its numerous and increasing victories have resulted from its divinity. Many, alas, are indifferent to its calls and listen not to the voice which it utters, inviting them to try it. Many, we fear, endeavor to persuade themselves that its credibility is a question not capable of being settled. Unwilling to be regarded as positively disaffected, refusing to be numbered with avowed foes, they prefer to be silent, and in the chambers of imagery within, portray it as covered with clouds, shadows and darkness.

Too often is it the case that our disinclination to examine it, and the scepticism and infidelity, which we entertain are the consequence of directing the attention to some one of our race, high in our estimation for his intellectual endowments, and favored by the approbation of men for various admirable qualities. We derive, from the want of religious sentiments,

the display of unconcern, or the avowal of disbelief in them, corroboration, or impulse to a career of cheerless neglect of God and hostility to the revelation of his will. This is a question not to be settled by authority. It rests upon a different foundation. It is entirely independent of any reception or rejection of any man, or number of men. It stands or falls upon its own intrinsic merits. We need not be afraid to let the question be decided upon authority, for the history of christianity proves that it has secured the homage of men in all ages, whose testimony in its favor is much more deserving of respect than all the counter testimony, which it enemies have spoken against it.

We ask, however, that turning away from men, either high or low, learned, or unlearned, that we should let the oracles of God speak for themselves, submit them to a strict scrutiny directed to the record itself, and hear the witnesses that are accessible on every question within the limits of historic verification. If the external and the internal testimony is not satisfactory, then do we authorize its utter rejection, though many great men proclaim its excellence and pronounce it the message of the most High God. I regard the careful perusal of the Bible as an admirable antidote against all doubts. It does not seem possible to cultivate the habit of reading it seriously, without being won to admire and believe. It is not the voice of man that speaks from its holy pages. It is a higher, a more powerful voice. Should we fail to perceive this, I know no solution of it but the perversion of our moral taste, and no remedy but the renewing, converting influence of the Spirit of God. Christianity, tested by obedience to its requisitions, will not fail to commend itself. In the school of experiment every pupil has found, or every new matriculant will find, that he, that doeth the will of God, will know that the doctrines of Jesus are the doctrines of God.

Finally we regard the young as in danger of permitting temporal things to exert so great a power over them as to conceal their relations to another state of things.

It was early perceived by the human heart that there is a spiritual world, and that we are related to it. The precise nature of this relation, and the duties which result from it were the subject of much and careful investigation, and the source of exceedingly beautiful speculations, with at least germs of eternal truth, but the amount of clearly established knowledge was not great. We may refer you to the Phaedon of Plato and to that treatise amongst the Tusculan disputa-

tions of Cicero, entitled *De contemnanda morte*, for fine exemplifications of the heart of man acknowledging its relations to a higher state of existence, and pouring forth its longings to extend its views of its characteristics. How much do these noble heathen, in their deep solicitude to know God and the things of God, in their turning away from this transient scene to gaze with whatever of vision they might on the world to come, in their ardent longings after immortality and in their deep conviction that happiness and virtue are inseparable associates in every part of the dominion of God, shame us, who have received those messages which they believed could alone settle the questions, and heard Him who has instructed us, as ὡς δέ τις θεός ταῦτα προσ αὐτῷ πάντας διατίθει, but remain unmoved and prefer to consecrate our fine power to the pursuit of the perishable vanities of a decaying world ! Most true is it that the things, that are seen, operate powerfully upon us and tend mightily to render us sensuous and earthly. It is easy before habits of reflection are formed, whilst the sensibilities are in their highest activity, to give ourselves up to an admonition and devotion to surrounding objects, so intense as to render the mind indisposed to inquire for aught beyond. The world and the things of the world become every thing to us. Its pleasures, its riches, its honors are sought with an avidity, that knows no abatement. Life is employed, as if its purpose was fulfilled, in securing the highest amount of enjoyment from the present state of things. The things of eternity shadowed forth in the whispers of reason and of our moral nature rendered clear by a revelation from the Great Creator himself are not permitted to occupy our thoughts, or to interest our affections.

This then is the danger, to which every young man is exposed, and how shall he escape? He must think. He must listen to the words of eternal life.

Meditating on the world and the providence of God, and seeking interpretations of these in his word, looking to the end and always counting the cost, these may be endorsed as tried means of dissolving the spell which fastens him to earth and preparing him to mount to brighter and better worlds.

When men attain the end of life, they wish to have made the best use of it. Many, who have not done so deeply regret it. Many who have in a great degree acted wisely, nevertheless deplore that so much of folly has mingled with what they have done. How to use life best is the great inquiry?

Wisdom descending from above has taught us. Another teacher would turn away our hearts and turn us from its instructions, it speaks with great force, yet if we follow we pass through regions of sorrow to an eternal abode of woe, but heeding the better instructor, we are blessed in this world, blessed in the world to come.

I have thought of other dangers, but perhaps I have occupied time enough. Think of them and guard against them. May God be your protector and keep you from the evil, that is in the world!

We dismiss you with our best wishes and prayers, desiring that you may be guarded against all evil. Much depends on yourselves. Perform well your part. Act not for a moment, but for eternity. Seek to be good men and true, to leave behind you influences of a salutary kind. This is the interest of man. This is the will of God!

ARTICLE IX.

REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

IN continuation of our series of deceased Lutheran ministers, we resume the consideration of those excellent men who, in our earlier history, came from Halle and laid the foundation of the Lutheran Church in this Western land. They were men of genuine, practical piety, of earnest, laborious effort, deeply imbued with the missionary spirit and burning with an ardent zeal to build up the waste places of Zion, and to advance the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Their memory should be cherished, their virtues and their services transmitted to future generations and distant ages. They are all worthy of a permanent record in the history of our Church. Confident are we, that so long as we are true to the spirit which animated these patriarchs, and maintain the position which they occupied, we will prosper; our high mission will be fulfilled and much good will be accomplished! We only regret that, at this late period, our sources of information are so limited, as to render our narrative necessarily brief and less complete and satisfactory than could be desired.

We trust, however, that the facts, here presented, may be of some interest to the reader, and of some value to the future historian of the Church. Sketches have already been given of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, *primus inter pares*, regarded by all as the Apostle of Lutheranism in this country, who landed on these shores in 1742, of Brunnholtz, Kurtz and Schaum, who came in 1745, of Handschuh, in 1748, of Schultze, in 1765, of Helmuth and Schmidt in 1769 and of Kunze, who arrived in 1770, all with the sanction and authority of the Halle Professors. In the present paper we propose to give the little material, we have been able to gather, in reference to Heintzelman, who commenced his labors here in 1751, and of Krug and Voigt, who, sent forth under the same auspices, became identified with us in 1764. Although the more minute details of their life and ministry may have passed into oblivion, their memory can never die.

XLVII.

JOHN DIETRICH MATTHIAS HEINTZELMAN

Was born in the year 1726 in Salzwedel, in Altenmark, in the electorate of Brandenberg. His father was a Physician, with means sufficiently ample to afford the best facilities for the son's education. Elementary instruction was imparted to him in the schools of his native place. Thence he was transferred to Stendal and subsequently to the Royal Prussian College in Saxony. His studies were completed at the University of Halle. Having passed over the *curriculum*, he was now ready to enter upon the work, to which he had devoted himself, and to labor in whatever field Providence might assign him. About the time an application was presented to the Faculty of the Institution from the corporation of St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, for a minister to assist Pastor Brunnholtz in the arduous duties, which devolved upon him. Our people in their necessities always turned to Halle, and seldom in vain. There was a deep sympathy felt for their suffering brethren in a foreign land, and an earnest desire evinced to supply their spiritual wants. Among the students, too, there had been quite a missionary spirit awakened, and there were generally found some who were willing to respond favorably to any requisition, made for their services. On this occasion, when the application was received, the attention of the Professors was immediately directed to young Heintzelman, then about twenty-five years old, and he was selected

for the position, says the record, "on account of his integrity and aptitude for the work." Having obtained the consent of his parents, the path of duty seems clear. Without any hesitation he accepts the call and, at once, prepares for the journey. In order, however, that he may immediately on his arrival enter upon the discharge of his official duties he is first, after a satisfactory examination, ordained to the work of the ministry, by the *Consistorium* of Wernigerode, in Saxony. On the 11th of July 1751, he bids adieu to those whom he holds most dear on earth, with no expectation of meeting them again this side of the grave, and casts his eyes, for the last time, upon his native land. He does not, however, waver in his decision. He has counted the cost, and does not consider his life dear that he may bring souls to Christ. With unfaltering trust in that Divine arm, which had promised to sustain him in his trials and strengthen him in his work, he takes his departure by way of London for Philadelphia, accompanied by Rev. Frederick Schultz, who was expected as assistant minister for the Churches at New Hanover and Providence. They reached this country on the 1st of December, 1751, and were most cordially welcomed. It was to Dr. Muhlenberg, who was most anxiously awaiting their arrival, an occasion of great joy. He immediately communicated with Dr. Ziegenhagen of London, and Professor Francke of Halle, expressing his heartfelt satisfaction and grateful acknowledgements. "The Lord's name," says he, "be praised, for so graciously providing for us! It is an evidence of the goodness and kind favor He shows to his people."

Mr. Heintzelman became an inmate of Mr. Brunnholtz's family, and, at once commenced the duties required of him. They were laborious, but he discharged them faithfully, efficiently and successfully. He preached, catechised and performed other pastoral work, and, for a season, until another teacher could be procured, had the charge of the congregational school, giving instruction to one hundred scholars, three hours every day. He seemed to feel a special interest in the young, and to them he devoted much of his attention. It was his practice to meet his Catechumens, three times every week. He carefully instructed them in "Luther's Catechism" and in "Stark's Order of Salvation," and regularly heard them recite passages of Scripture, which they had committed to memory. Dr. Muhlenberg writes, "The congregation seems well satisfied with Mr. Heintzelman, and cherishes for him a high regard. He is kept busily engaged in his work

and is to me a great comfort." But his career on earth was brief—his labors were speedily arrested. His course, which bade so fair, was early terminated. He fell in the ripeness of his years, in the vigor of manhood, in the midst of his usefulness, with his armor on and in the field of conflict. His health seemed for some time impaired and, during the last year or two of his life, he experienced several attacks of illness. The best medical skill was employed for his restoration to health, but without effect. Prayers, public and private, were offered on his behalf, but the work God had assigned him on earth was accomplished, and he ripened for Heaven. During his sickness the Lord exercised him in faith, patience and humility. He died of inflammation and ulceration of the liver, February 9th, 1756, in the 30th year of his age. He was prepared for the change. He was conscious of his approaching end, but was calm and submissive, cheerful and happy in the prospect of death. He sent for his colleague and requested him to select some Hymns, and to bring several children from the schools to his dying chamber for the purpose of singing them. This was done, and he listened to them with the deepest interest, in the full possession of all his powers. A few hours afterwards he entered upon his eternal rest, in the exercise of a most filial and trusting spirit, with a firm and sustaining hope of salvation, based solely upon the mercy of God, through the merits of Jesus Christ.

"His last thoughts were God's—his last words prayer!"

He was buried in St. Michael's Church, in front of the altar. A large congregation assembled to witness the funeral obsequies. It is said, "tears flowed copiously." Children and adults, who had enjoyed his instructions, exhibited the deepest emotion. All felt that a severe stroke had been inflicted upon the Church, a heavy loss sustained in the removal of this efficient laborer in the vineyard of the Lord. The occasion was improved by the delivery of two discourses, the one in German, by Rev. John F. Handschuh, from the texts, "Thou hast also given me the shield of thy Salvation, and thy gentleness hath made me great," and "Thou hast enlarged my steps under me, that my feet did not slip;" the other in English, by the Swedish Lutheran Provost Acrelius, from the words, "And I heard a voice from Heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them."

Mr. Heintzelman was married to a sister of Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg's wife, a daughter of Conrad Weiser, of Tulpehocken, so distinguished in the colonial annals of Pennsylvania, as confidential Indian interpreter and magistrate of the Province. From this union there was one son, a posthumous child, born the day after his father's death. At his Baptism, the Swedish Lutheran minister, Acrelius and Henry Keppel, stood as sponsors. He died, when yet a young man, in consequence of injuries, received by a fall from a horse.

From all that we have been able to gather respecting the subject of the present sketch, we infer that he was a man of learning and piety, an example of a consistent, faithful and intelligent minister of the Gospel. Enjoying in his youth advantages, the most favorable for mental culture, he had assiduously improved them and prepared himself thoroughly for the work, to which he was called. His piety was of a devoted practical character, his life, unsullied and blameless. He was regarded by all as an earnest and upright Christian, whose constant endeavor it was to do the will of his Heavenly Father, and to bring others under the influence of Divine truth. There was, at all times, in his manner deep seriousness, producing the conviction of his cordial sincerity. Although his labors extended over a space of not much more than four years, they were not in vain. He enjoyed the warm regard and undiminished confidence of the congregation, to whom he ministered, exercised the shepherd's watchful care over his flock and gave himself up wholly to his sacred office.

X L V I I I .

JOHN LEWIS VOIGT.

The arrival of Dr. Muhlenberg in 1742 marked a new era in the history of our Church in this country. The first Lutheran Synod was organized in 1748. Accessions were made, from time to time, to the ranks of the ministry, principally however, from the institutions at Halle. But still great desuetude prevailed. "The harvest was truly plenteous but the laborers few." The tide of immigration was on the increase. Thousands of Germans were annually reaching our shores, who were as sheep without a shepherd, deprived of the regular means of grace and exposed to the most deleterious influences. Besides death, from whose unrelenting power no position or period of life is exempt, had been busy making in-

roads upon the little band of devoted laborers. Heintzelman and Brunnholtz were both sleeping in the grave. It was necessary to repair their loss and make provision for the pressing wants of those, scattered through the waste places of our Zion, who were stretching out their hands and importunately begging for bread. The Macedonian cry for help was heard from all directions. As assistance could be expected only from Europe, Dr. Muhlenberg, who mourned over the desolations, that existed, lost no time in renewing his efforts and in sending earnest appeals to the Theological Faculty at Halle. The application was again successful. In obedience to the call Voigt and Krug, *par nobile fratrum*, came to this country in 1764. The numerical strength of our Church at this time in Philadelphia may be inferred from the fact, that after the adoption by the Church of certain regulations for the government of the members more than 900, the heads of families, signed the same. There were also forty congregations, found in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Virginia, in connexion with the Synod, organized just sixteen years before.

John Lewis Voigt was born in the year 1731, in Mansfield. He was regularly educated for the ministry and, at the conclusion of his course, was, for several years, a Preceptor in the Orphan House at Halle. Subsequently he filled the office of Inspector and acquired a high reputation for fidelity and success in the discharge of his duties. It was this, that suggested him, as a suitable individual for the missionary work in this country, when the call was presented. He was ordained to the office of the holy ministry by the *Consistorium* at Wernigerode and taking the usual route, by way of London, in company with Mr. Krug, arrived in Philadelphia, April 1st 1764. He met, of course with a kind reception and preached his first sermon, on the following Lord's Day, from the words of the Psalmist: "Let mount Zion rejoice, let the daughters of Judah be glad, because of thy judgment." Several weeks after his arrival he spent, in filling appointments at Germantown, Providence and New Hanover and then, for a longer period, by direction of the President of Synod, took charge of the congregation at Germantown. In that day, every minister was required to labor for a season, in that field which, in the judgment of Synod, was most in need of pastoral services. The power in the interim of Synod, was invested in the presiding officer. Mr. Voigt was however, during the year, elected by the congregations themselves, as Pastor of the Churches at

Germantown and Barren-Hill. This relation he continued to sustain, until the close of the year 1765, when he assumed the pastoral care of the congregations at the Trappe and New Hanover. For many years his residence was at the Trappe. He subsequently removed to Vincent, still retaining however, his connexion with the Trappe Church, and also serving as Pastor of one or two other congregations. The congregation at Vincent was organized upwards of one hundred years ago, and is now known by the name of Zion's Church. It is in Chester County, not far from Phoenixville. The Church is a very ancient structure, having been built before the Revolutionary-war. During the war, it was used by the soldiers as a Hospital. At the time of its erection it was considered one of the finest Church edifices in the country. It is still good, and its demolition would be regarded by many as a sacrilege, in consequence of the interesting and time-honored associations, connected with it. Mr. Voigt was its first Pastor after the war. He continued to labor for many years, in this region of country, where he died at an advanced age, enjoying as a minister of the Gospel, the confidence and esteem of all who knew him. His Library he bequeathed to the congregation, at Vincent. He was buried in front of the Church door, where a neat marble monument, erected, at the time, by the congregation, as an evidence of their regard for his memory and commemorative of his services, still marks the resting place of this venerable man. We find on the stone the following inscription in German, "Here repose the remains of Rev. Lewis Voigt, once the faithful and zealous Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran congregation at this place. Mansfeld in Germany was the native country of the deceased; the time of his birth was the 9th of November, in the year of our Lord 1731. He died the 28th of December 1800, in the 70th year of his distinguished life."

Mr. Voigt survived the Patriarch Muhlenberg, thirteen years. Between them there had always existed the most intimate relations, the most cordial attachment. On the occasion of his death, Mr. Voigt preached the funeral discourse from the text, "Lord who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness and speaketh the truth in his heart."

The subject of our sketch was regarded by his contemporaries as worthy of all confidence, a man of sincere, simple piety, of ardent zeal, active benevolence and of a consistent and ex-

emplary life. Early trained to habits of industry, thorough mental discipline and sound religious principles, there was an energetic strength imparted to his character, which particularly fitted him for his difficult and arduous position, and enabled him to exert an influence for good and to leave an impress upon the times, in which he lived. He was deeply interested in the work entrusted to him. To this all the faculties of his mind and the powers of his body were devoted. He labored faithfully for the spiritual improvement of his flock, the elevation of the people and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. He never shrank from the defence of the truth, never hesitated to sacrifice comfort, reputation or any thing else in the maintenance of principle. It was the burden of his heart and the purpose of his life to honor his Master in the salvation of souls. He earnestly implored the Divine guidance and confidently looked for the promised assistance. His faith was of that simple, filial, genuine nature, so characteristic of our earlier ministers and always apparent in their daily arrangements and actions. His duties were laborious, his life was a picture of Apostolic zeal. Not only in the temple, but in every house he ceased not to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. His influence was salutary, his efforts were blessed. Many manifest seals were given to his ministry. Free from many of the infirmities, which often cling even to good men, and ever abounding in things, true and good and lovely and of good report,

"his life,
Sweet to himself, was exercised in good,
That still survives his name and memory."

X L I X.

JOHN ANDREW KRUG.

Was born in Saxony, March 19th 1732. He also was highly educated and was, for a season, connected with the Orphan House at Halle, as a Preceptor. He then labored as a Catechist, at Wasserleben, in the Earldom of Wernigerode. He was not, however, ordained, as a regular minister of the Gospel, until just before his departure for this country. Leaving home with his friend Voigt and passing through Holland, he reached London Nov. 14th 1763, having stopped by the way to visit relatives. During the journey several incidents occurred, which seemed to satisfy his mind more fully in re-

ference to his decision and made him feel, that God approved his course and designed him to labor in this foreign land. He speaks of the comfort, which the reading of God's word afforded and of the encouragement, derived from some devotional German Hymns, sung at Family Worship during his sojourn among his friends, which were so appropriate to his state of mind and the circumstances of his condition, and seemed sent from Heaven as God's message to him. The voyage was pleasant and safe, and on reaching this country he gratefully acknowledges, in a letter to Dr. Francke, the kind and special Providence, which watched over him during the journey. He arrived, April 1st 1764. He repaired immediately to Dr. Muhlenberg's house, who most cordially received the missionaries and immediately sent for his colleagues to come and rejoice with him. The Deacons of the Church also called to bid them welcome. The Swedish Provost, on behalf of his brethren, as soon as he heard the tidings, came too, for the purpose of tendering his friendly greetings.. In those days they were all of "one heart and of one soul," sympathizing with one another in their joys and their sorrows, their trials and their successes, their interests and their duties, and co-operating in the great work, in which they were united. On Thursday following his arrival, Mr. Krug lectured for Dr. Muhlenberg and some idea of the man may, perhaps, be formed from the theme he selected for his first discourse, in this new field of labor. It was based on the words, "For all these things hath mine hand made and all these things have been, saith the Lord: but to this man will I look, even to him, that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word."

Before the subject of our narrative located permanently, he spent some time with Dr. Muhlenberg and Mr. Handschuh, and aided them in their labors. His first regular charge was at Reading, Pa. When the position was first offered to him, he was very reluctant to accept it, in consequence of the magnitude of the work and the low estimate he entertained of his own abilities. He remained here just seven years, with character untarnished, wholly devoted to his work, and greatly beloved by his people. "He came to us," says the Church record, "as a faithful teacher, and served the congregation seven years, in love and sincerity towards God and man. At every opportunity he exhibited his generosity in every good cause, both to the Church, school and to the poor, who alone knew the benefits conferred." When he resigned, it is added, it was "to the great grief of the many

earnest lovers of his teachings, both in and out of Reading." It was, however, thought proper by his brethren in the ministry, that he should take charge of our Lutheran interests in Frederick, Md., and he cheerfully acquiesced in their judgment. He accordingly assumed the pastoral care of this Church, April 28th, 1771. He was, at the time, in the 40th year of his age, in the prime of life and the vigor of manhood, regarded by all as "a man of ripe scholarship, a man of mind, of goodness and piety." In his appearance, at this period, he is represented "as somewhat small in stature, slender in form, rather feeble in voice and not very fluent in his utterance." He soon won upon the confidence of the people, and there was a strong prepossession in his favor. Very soon affairs in the Church wore quite a different aspect, the congregation was in a prosperous condition, the improvement was apparent to all. "The communon list," it is said, "swelled its numbers, and many young persons were added to the Church by the rite of confirmation." This state of things continued until the whole land was disturbed by the horrors of war. During the period of our revolutionary struggle, the Church every where suffered. At such a time the cause of religion necessarily languishes. The din of arms and the carnage of the battle-field are not the scenes for the promotion of piety or the advancement of Christian enterprise. When the contest terminated and peace prevailed, there was a change for the better throughout the country. The interests of our Church again revived at Frederick, as elsewhere, and presented the most encouraging prospects. Improvement was manifest in every direction. The congregation was more flourishing than at any previous period. Mr. Krug continued to labor here, until the end of his life, his connection with the congregation embracing a period of twenty-five years. Although the earlier part of his ministry was so popular and successful, his later years were embittered by a feeling of opposition to him. A party in the congregation rose up against him, who found fault with the good old man, spoke disparagingly of his efforts and expressed a desire for a change. The effort to displace him failed, yet it awakened in his breast anxious thought and caused him many a sad hour. He had, however, warm friends who were devoted to him and highly valued his services. The hand of death was finally laid upon him, and he passed calmly to his rest. His dissolution took place the 30th of March, 1796, in the 60th year of his age. He was followed to the grave by many

friends, who were strongly attached to him, and loved him for his labors. His remains were deposited beneath the aisle of the old Lutheran Church, in which he had so long preached, among the people, with whom he spent the evening of his days.

Mr. Krug was married to Henrietta Handschuh, daughter of Rev. John F. Handschuh. She survived her husband many years, and died at Frederick in the year 1822, in the 71st year of her age. From this union, we believe, there were four children, the youngest of whom died during the past year at the age of sixty-six.

Mr. Krug was a good man, distinguished for his great simplicity, purity and integrity of character. He loved religion from an inward conviction of its Divine power and made it the governing principle of his whole life. He was a humble, unostentatious, genuine Christian. He deeply felt the responsibility of his position and was diligent in promoting the prosperity of Zion. He was evangelical and instructive in the pulpit and his pure and earnest life gave weight and sanction to his words. When he preached the Scriptures were carefully expounded and the truth faithfully applied to the consciences of his hearers. His heart ever went forth in tender sympathy with his flock and he was most laborious in his professional duties. His field of labor extended over a large district and his congregation was numerous, yet he was never remiss in his visits to the sick, in administering comfort to the afflicted and the tried, encouraging the desponding and perplexed, admonishing the wayward and in catechising the young. He was mild in his disposition, warm in his affections, and kind-hearted in his intercourse, of such a nature as to inspire confidence and to secure regard. Although many years have passed away since his departure from us, the deep impression he produced and his earnest devotion to the course of his Master will not soon be forgotten. His name will be gratefully cherished and his memory revered by the Church.

"Peace to the just man's memory ; let it grow
Greener with years, and blossom through the flight
Of ages. * * * * *
The glorious record of his virtues write,
And hold it up to men, and bid them claim
A palm like his, and catch from him the hallow'd flame!"

ARTICLE X.

THE DEFENCE OF STEPHEN. ACTS 7th.

Translated from the German.—*Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, May 1859.

The proper understanding of this defence depends on a clear view of the accusation, and a proper determination of what was to be met, and for these the means are at hand. The accusation runs: This man perseveres in uttering blasphemies against the holy place and the law; and the proof lay in the declaration made by him: "Jesus of Nazareth will destroy the temple and change the customs which Moses gave us" (6,18 fq.) Stephen had no more said than the Lord himself said: I came to destroy the temple (Matt. 26, 61, John 2, 19); in both places there was perversion and consequently false testimony. But both accusations have the same foundation. Proceed, Jesus purposes to say, to contemn the glory of the Lord, and you will bring the judgments of God against this house; you yourselves, will destroy it with your sins, your enmity to the Lord of Glory will yet destroy this temple. Thus spake the Lord, and Stephen, who saw the progress of the enmity of the people against the Lord's anointed, predicted more solemnly the fulfilment of the divine threatening. He pointed to the approaching judgment, the destruction of God's house, the dispersion of his people, the transfer of the Lord's kingdom to other nations and that then, in a foreign land, a new people would come to the Lord and serve him in holy drapery. This divine judgment, which Stephen saw like a dark thunder-cloud hovering over Jerusalem and its inhabitants, the man of God announced, and it is easy to explain the bitter hate which was excited against him in the entire population. When he was accused of this before the Sanhedrim, he could neither deny nor soften it, otherwise he could not be a faithful witness of the Lord. Stephen had to reiterate his words and then to prove that there was no blasphemy and that he had neither profaned Moses nor the temple. The subject of the defence is, *that the announcement of God's judgment against the temple at Jerusalem and the people was not blasphemy.*

But how does Stephen prove this, in what he says? This portion of Scripture has often fared badly, either it has been considered an imperfect sketch full of mistakes and misrepresentations, or a collection of historical facts, narrated loosely, or it has been given up as obscure and even when the right course was seen, it was not pursued. Nevertheless long ago, Valent. Ernst Löscher adopted the right course, when in his "Evangelischen Zehnten Gottgeheiligter Amtssorgen (18,-237ff), he thus writes about this discourse: I perceive, that this discourse, delivered before a learned auditory, consists entirely of Enthymemes, as the *protasis*, the antecedent, is derived from a specific profound reflection and the *apodosis*, the consequence, is left to be made by the hearers." Löscher now attempts the explanation and produces singular things and occasionally some that do not amount to much, but has certainly, by his extraordinary remarks, opened the way. In this way, it seems, Thiersch, in his history of the ancient Christian Church (p. 83), proceeds, when he says: What Stephen says of Moses might have furnished commentators the key to the whole, for Moses is certainly compared with Christ in his earlier history and the course of the Jews towards Christ is reproved by their conduct towards Moses. The anger of the Jewish Sanhedrim (Magnates) proves clearly that they understood Stephen's discourse better than Christian theologians, according to whose ordinary explanation there is very little to vindicate the accused and nothing to discomfit his adversaries. Stephen presents to the Sanhedrim the history of the past as a mirror of the present and when the solution of the enigma is once found, then appear displayed in this discourse, not only new and pertinent doctrines but, likewise, predictions." Thus Thiersch and then he attempts, in a few, condensed strokes, to explain this discourse accordingly, although there may be dissent from some things and much omitted, still it is gratifying that Löscher's method has been revived and honored, in this way alone do we expect our theme to be sustained.

How then does Stephen manage his theme? Every reader will notice, that in verse 14th, there is a new turn; likewise that in 17th, a new period begins both in German and the Greek text. If we notice the contents of these three parts, which lie on the surface, the verse commencing 44th treats of the temple, that at 17th, of Moses and the law, and who can fail to notice with what emphasis the commencement of this discourse points to the Lord of Glory? Thus, God, Moses,

the Temple : these are the three points of the discourse and if we turn back to (6, 11, 13f.) there are the three points of the accusation against him. He vilified the Temple, Moses, God. So runs the indictment, and to this Stephen responds, only that he has adopted the natural order ; for Moses and the law are more than the temple which is subsidiary to the law and the Lord of glory is greater than Moses who is only his faithful servant. Stephen defends himself thus, that in his denunciation of the judgment, he neither blasphemeth God (2-17-2), nor Moses (17-43) 3), nor the Temple (44-53). But moves along throughout in a double form. For that which his opponents charged upon him he repels and makes it recoil on themselves ; he is not a blasphemer (2-9), but much rather they (9-10) : he has not defamed Moses, (17, 28), but they have (39, 43), he has not spoken injuriously against the temple (44, 50), but they are the real defamers of the Sanctuary (51, 53). But Stephen advances still another step. He defends himself, and disenthralls himself of the guilt and carries it home to his prosecutors ; the defendant blames the plaintiff and guilt is burned in on their conscience. This gives a clear insight into their embittered rage which followed his address. They could make no reply, but became themselves the respondents, who might either defend themselves or put out of the way their accuser, for his words, arrow-like, pierced deeply the heart and conscience. Such is the discourse in general and we will now attempt specification.

I. The whole contents of the discourse is at once seen in the first words by the careful observer. It was considered outrageous that the kingdom of God should be taken from them and transferred from a condemned people to a people, whose manners and customs were different, for thus they understood Stephen's announcement of the divine indignation against the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the Sanctuary. To this Stephen opposed the God of glory in all his majesty, i. e. the God happy in himself, who self-sufficient and independent and is subservient to nothing whatever. God has no need of you, Stephen designs to say at once, he can raise up children from stones ; if you are disobedient, he will turn away and give you up to the long threatened judgments. In this way, Stephen at the very outset, dissipates the self-complacency of his opponents, who called themselves preeminently the friends of God, to whom the Lord was bound, so that he could never give them up, and subject them to punishment. This would have been enough for upright persons, but his judges and accusers

were not such, and therefore Stephen had further to prove that he did not, by his threatening, slander God.

How did God act from the very beginning? The chiefs of Israel, before whom Stephen, the accused, stood, called themselves proudly the children of Abraham, he presented an exemplification in their father Abraham of God's ways and dealings. For when God revealed himself to Abraham the first thing was the command to leave home and relations and to go into a country which should be designated. With a command to go out, the history of God's people commences, to show, that God is not restricted to country and people, but that his word and promise are the essential matters. It was grace, that the God of glory chose Abraham, and whither he went, depended upon his gracious will. A removal from the Fatherland was the way to the kingdom, begun with the opening history of the kingdom. When Stephen proclaimed, that the kingdom of God would again remove to a strange land, as in the case of Abraham, so now the true Abraham, more than he, Jesus Christ would leave home and friends and go amongst other people, was this to be regarded as blasphemy? The history of the old covenant, beginning with a command to go out, is it blasphemy when the history of the new covenant commences with a separation and emancipation? Was not the command of God to Abraham adequate proof that Stephen, in proclaiming judgment, was not guilty of defamation? He said nothing of the second Abraham but what had long before happened to the first (v. 2, 3). If Abraham's merit consisted entirely in his obedience of faith, exercising faith without knowing the end of his pilgrimage, exercised it without possessing a foot of ground, exercised it when he was childless, exercised it too when his posterity were doomed to four hundred years oppression and he could only look for the promised redemption in the distant future, when all his life was in faith and he received circumcision a seal of his faith, and likewise Isaac and Jacob, when all three patriarchs knew nothing, and would know nothing but faith in God's promises, whatever they might be; was not Stephen and those who were with him right when closing their eyes upon all they saw and looked to the word and command of God, when Abraham-like, they heard the command to separate and depart, as soon as the call of the Lord directed them to go from one land to another. Is Stephen a blasphemer in following Father Abraham? Is he a defamer of God's glory, when he requires treading in the footsteps of the first three patriarchs (v. 4. 8)?

But Stephen turns back the charge and throws it upon the head of his accusers : he did not revile God, but they who treated contemptuously the Lord of glory and having given, in the history of Abraham, a picture of the Lord and his people, now he does the same in the history of Joseph and his brothers. The true Joseph, in whom Jacob's son was realized, was amongst them and they had treated him as those wicked brothers had Joseph, these brothers were the representatives of his Judges and accusers. The patriarchs envied Joseph, and was not Pilate convinced that the Jews had delivered up Christ from envy, (Matt. 27: 18)? The envy of these brothers induced them to sell him to a foreign people, Judah taking the lead and exulting in the price he obtained ; they sold him into Egypt, where he experienced the deepest degradation and humiliation, he was imprisoned and had to sojourn between two felons, all of which was fulfilled in the true Joseph with minute exactness is perfectly clear. But God was with that Joseph ; they lost with their brother fortune and favor. God's blessing went with Joseph to Egypt, and the Lord delivered him from every sorrow, and removed him from the deepest humiliation ; God gave him power and wisdom before the king, so that he placed him at his right hand, and the whole population bowed before him ; and whoever hears the history of Joseph, does not need much illustration, in what manner the true Joseph too, the Lord Jesus, in all his tribulation, was not forsaken of God his Father, and how he, redeemed from all reproach and suffering, was elevated to God's right hand, in Egypt, too, amongst a strange people, it was his brethren that rejected him and were not willing that he should reign over them. The envy of his brethren according to the flesh, caused the removal of the Lord's kingdom from them and its transfer to the Heathen, (v. 9-10).

To Stephen himself, who prayed with his dying breath for his kinsmen, this threatened judgment was distressing ; therefore he cannot resist the introduction, from the further history of Joseph, of a true Gospel with the hope that they might be led to reflect to their salvation. When Joseph was sold, what took place ? A famine occurred, the house of Jacob suffered from the want of necessaries ; finally they heard that there was bread in Egypt, not in the holy land, not in other lands, only where Joseph was, was there bread, and there they sought and found it, and when they repeated the

search, they found not only it but the lost brother ; their eyes were opened and they saw what they had done to their brother. No sooner did this take place than they found in him a remedy and assistance. Joseph invited his brothers and his father's family to come to him, and supplied them with food and other necessaries. How near in this history is the application ; was it not a real message of love, inviting and encouraging to come to the true Joseph ? Stephen means to say,, truly a famine will soon appear ; it had already commenced, for with Jesus, the true Joseph, happiness and blessing had departed from Israel ; but he proceeds, a time will come, then will they hear, where there is bread, viz : without, in despised Egypt, in the Heathen world, and not only will they find bread there, but him too who gave the bread, viz : the lost brother ; they will see him whom they pierced, they will find Jesus their sold brother. This true Joseph will receive them graciously. He will provide for them. He will bring them in due time into the land of their fathers. He will not be ashamed of them. He will acknowledge them as his, and replace them in his holy land. This joyful prediction mitigates the severity of the judgment, which he brings against them as blasphemers of God. Abundantly was it proved that Stephen was no blasphemer, for he had not blasphemed, he had only said, what had occurred at the beginning of God's administration of his kingdom, but his accusers were guilty of blasphemy, who would nevertheless in due time acknowledge it and return to their rejected brethren, (v. 11-16).

II. After Stephen had thus victoriously repelled the first charge, he turns to the second, in which the allegation is, that he has traduced Moses by his proclamation of judgment. In this part of his defence, he pursues a course correspondent with the first. Here too he holds up the history of the past as a mirror of the present, that they may learn for their salvation. He unfolds Christ in the history of Moses, and the views are highly instructive, which open all around. He would understand, who can penetrate the meaning and make the proper application of the altered truths, which Stephen could not bring out openly, without raising a storm of opposition, which would have arrested him at once, while they were compelled to hear such a lively representation of history. With three strokes Stephen describes the time when Moses was born. It was a time, when the people were numerous, when a king arose, who evil entreated the people, when in-

fants were put to death. Whoever heard this account, did he not see in the present period an exact counterpart? Were not the people numerous now? Had not a strange ruler come, who maltreated the people, not merely the Heathen but likewise the Idumean monarchs? and did not Herod direct that murder of children that the hope and future of Israel might be destroyed? Was not, by means of the time of Moses, the Sanhedrim brought prominently before the view, (v. 17-19). When man's power fails, God is at hand, and when Pharaoh thought he had exterminated the people, then was the Savior of the people quietly and secretly born, and how wonderfully was he saved in the first days of his infancy, how wonderfully was he brought up and instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, in the end became a man mighty in words and deeds. Does it not seem as if Stephen, with these last words, which are evidently derived from the discourse of the disciples from Emmaus (Luke 24, 19), unconsciously went over from the figurative to the literal? as if he wished to impress deeply his hearers and readers with the knowledge of this Moses, and that another child was likewise miraculously sustained and brought up, till he became a man, mighty in words and deeds, namely the Prophet from Nazareth, Jesus the Lord (v. 20, 22)? When that Moses was grown up, he desired to see his brethren, for he had not forgotten them, he had an affection for them, and when he saw one suffering unjustly he assisted him against his opposer. He supposed his brethren would understand, that God, through him, would deliver them, he desired by the deed to present himself as a deliverer to them, who would lead them forth from the land of bondage. His brethren would not acknowledge him, they discarded him with contempt, they were not willing that he should reign over them and Moses had to fly into a foreign land; there he remained as a stranger in the wilderness, in a heathen country, there amongst heathen were his children born. Thus happened it with Moses, who desired to be the Deliverer of his people and was it otherwise with the true Moses? When Jesus offered himself as a Saviour to the people, was it not said, Who made thee a judge or a ruler over us? and we will not have this man to reign over us? Had not Jesus the second Moses, to fly to the Heathen world and there to find a refuge and home? and were there not born to him children like the dew of the morning? Is it slander when Stephen announces that the kingdom of God would pass

to the Heathen ? First Moses withdraw, and is it slander when the second Moses is represented in the same way ?

If the kingdom of God and his promise were maintained in the wilderness, is it unwarranted to represent the kingdom of heaven as passing again to the Heathen ? Is not Stephen fully supported in his denunciation by the history of the man, who was so high in the estimation of his opponents, (v. 23-29) ?

But as Stephen in the history of Joseph, his heart bleeding in view of the threatenings, could not avoid, guided by the typical history, to cast a view into the future, so does he now. He aims by his consolatory message to lead to repentance after the announcement of heavy judgments. The history of Moses did not end with his rejection. He remained, it is true, for a long time in a foreign land, it appeared as if his people were to have nothing more to do with him ; but when this time was past, he saw the thorn bush, which burned in the fire, but was not consumed, the image of his people which were in the fire of tribulation, that everything corruptible might be burned off, but they themselves not destroyed by the fire. It was the Lord that appeared to him, and to whom even Moses could not come but with fear and trembling, and here he received the command to go to the help of his afflicted people. When he now appeared before his people, he was no longer rejected, but they received him and trusted in his name, obtained now help and deliverance, Israel was set free from the land of bondage. Thus, Stephen aims to say, will it go with you, the Moses, whom you rejected, will appear again ; the other Moses, before whom that same man of God could not stand without fear and trembling, will hereafter look upon his troubled and down-trodden people with favor and come again, and then will you no longer be ashamed of him, but confess him and seek aid and deliverance in him from all tribulation, (v. 30-33). Thus does Stephen explain to the Sanhedrim the present, by the history of the past, and opens a view into the distant future, exhibiting in the history of Moses, Jesus of Nazareth, first in his humiliation then in his exaltation, and teaches how Moses is illustrated and sustained by him, whom they refused. Moses out of Christ is nothing. Moses himself pointed to the prophet, whom the Lord would raise up from their brethren, and desired that all should listen to him. It was only in harmony with this Gospel, that Moses designed his law, given by God, should be received by his people. His mission was to proclaim the law

in Christ, the law as a pedagogue, leading to Christ, and who ever diverted the law from his pedagogical import, he opposed Moses, who designed by his legislation to prepare the way for the Lord. Thus did Stephen teach the proper method of understanding Moses, and showed the Sanhedrim, who made an idol of Moses, what his work was, and that he did not lessen but exalt the mission of Moses. Who surpassed Stephen, in the due appreciation and glorification of Moses, who was charged with being his calumniator (v. 37, 38.)? The people who calumniated him were very different and Stephen, the accused, who triumphantly repelled the charge, knew how to strike the guilty leaders, who boasted of Moses but really despised his word in their actions. Who was it that made the golden calf at Sinai and forsook Moses' commands? Was it not Aaron, the high priest, and their fathers' people who withdrew from Moses? Who was it, that in the wilderness deserted the Lord and despised the authority of Moses, who had to be reproved and condemned so severely by the Lord, through the mouth of the prophets? Was it not again the fathers of this people, who had Moses but did not obey his words? How was it now? Moses was truly present and one greater than Moses, the true Moses was at hand, Jesus the Lord, before whom Moses veiled his face and how was he received by the people? Was it now as it was then? Is not the high priest again at the front of the defection from God and teaching the people how to discard the Lord of glory? Are not the people weary of him and anxious for other Gods? As the word of Moses was despised under the old covenant so is it now; his command to hear the Prophet was rejected, the true Moses is not heard. Who are the calumniators of Moses? Is it Stephen, who understood and honored both the first and the second Moses and obeyed them sincerely or rather they, who despised both and would not follow their precepts? If in the old covenant, the threatening went forth from the mouth of God: I will carry you beyond Babylon, for punishment must follow sin, and rejection apostacy from God, is Stephen then a calumniator of Moses, when he announces a divine judgment against such a rejection of Moses and the true Moses, viz: that the Lord will now drive off his people from the land of promise into strange countries, and that the kingdom of God shall be transferred to a people that know him not? Truly indeed, Stephen did not disparage Moses, he is a true witness of the

Lord, but his enemies are culminatiors of Moses, as they and their fathers always were, they are still, and he uttered no calumny, who pronounced upon such self-complacent and self-sufficient people God's displeasure. It was made plain, Stephen did not traduce Moses by his threateunings of God's wrath (v. 39, 43).

III. A third point was to be established, that he did not by his threatening abate from the glory of the temple. The false witnesses gave prominence to this charge (6, 13), but Stephen knew well how much greater the Lord of the temple and his servant was than the temple itself and this part of the accusation is taken up last. It was considered a defamation of the temple to speak of its destruction as if the Lord was restricted to his house and had need of it.

To this it was easy for Stephen to reply. Had Israel always this temple? If the house was, necessary to God, he must always have had it. But when the people were chosen as a people, they had nothing but the tabernacle, God so ordered it and in the possession of it, the grace and blessing of God followed the people; they entered successfully the Holy and Land drove out the heathen inhabitants. Thus was it under Moses and Joshua, thus was it through the period of the judges, so was it under David, and even he, the man after God's heart, was not permitted to build a temple. Israel did not till Solomon's time obtain a temple, the people were five hundred years without a temple, and this was not its most unfortunate period. When Solomon was allowed to build a temple, was the Lord bound to it? Did he need it as a man needs his habitation? It was just at the consecration of the temple, that Solomon openly declared that the prophet Isaiah afterwards learned from him, that the Lord had a much better and glorious temple; his throne was in the heavens and his footstool the earth, he the august God had his sanctuary in the glory of his divine majesty. The Lord's dwelling amongst men was for them, not for him; it was necessary but gracious, and fools are they, who believed that the great God needed a house and was bound to it, fools were those counsellors, who supposed, because God had chosen this house for his dwelling, it must continue his sanctuary and blasphemous was the language of him who spoke of its destruction. Stephen did not by this means pollute the temple, but only said, what the servants of God had constantly affirmed, that the Lord was not bound to this house, but could withdraw his grace from the

unthankful and direct it to others who would gratefully receive it (v. 44, 50).

Much more were the Jews revilers of the temple, though they made it their boast. They might indeed with much self-complacency point to their zeal for the honor of God and to their strict attendance on the beautiful service of the Lord and his temple and it is true in regard to this their dignitaries were not deficient. But at the same time Stephen calls them blasphemers of the temple, for what was the character of those who professed to be its. He calls them stiff-necked, who observed the outward, but did not bind the neck under the gentle yoke, that the Lord laid upon them ; uncircumcised in heart and ears are they, for they neither hear aright, lay to heart nor permit the impurity and wickedness of their heart to be removed. They come to the house of God ; but they resist and close their heart against the spirit, who operates there, the word by which the Spirit knocks and would obtain entrance. They do as did their fathers. Was this the right use of the temple, to boast of devotion to it, but to close the heart and ear to the spirit who rules in the word ? That they did shut up their hearts, Stephen proves to them by this ; by the way in which they treated him who was the Alpha and the Omega, the essence and star of all God's word and of all prophecy. They boasted of the temple and the Lord of the temple, who had finally come to his house, they persecuted and rejected all his prophets and servants who testified of him, it was not otherwise with the law which prepared for him, they received but then despised it. These were the people, who were God's favorites, and yet refused to open their hearts to the word or to the Lord, whom it set forth, or to the law, which pointed to him. They boasted of the temple and despised the word, these were the true blasphemers of the temple but not Stephen, who in true obedience to God and his word proclaimed his judgment against the house of such blasphemers (v. 51, 53).

This ends Stephen's defence and we cannot entertain the oft mooted question, whether it was ended or not. What could or should he have said in addition ? Did he not refute his accusation step by step and triumphantly overthrow it ? Did not the arrows, shot at him, recoil upon his adversaries' head ? We read nothing of an interruption. True his opponents gnash their teeth, a subdued rage commences, but no one speaks or breaks loose upon him. It is his own declaration, that he beholds the glory of the Lord, viz : Jesus stand-

ing at the right hand of God, that produces an eruption of rage. But then his defence was closed and whoever marks the progress will be convinced that Stephen spoke no such mish-mash (untereinander) as many commentators suppose, but that a powerful spirit gave utterance from him and a wisdom, to which his enemies must succumb or meet with a deadly hate.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Christ and His Church in the Book of Psalms. By the Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, Author of the "Memoir of the Rev. R. M. M'Cheyne," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway.—1860.

WE have long felt and acknowledged that there is a depth and compass of meaning, a variety, breadth, importance and interest of spiritual relations, in which Christ and his Church are portrayed or typically exhibited in the book of Psalms, not adequately recognized by commentators on the Sacred Word, and hence very imperfectly perceived by its ordinary readers. A commentary aiming at the full and appropriate setting forth of this aspect of that "Hymn Book for all Times," has, therefore, been a desideratum, a desideratum which Mr. Bonar has, in the volume before us, attempted to supply. In this attempt he has been reasonably, in some respects eminently, successful. His work does not, indeed, penetrate as profoundly as we could wish into the deep meanings of the Psalmist, or point out all those connections which we believe, exist between this portion of Holy Writ, and the wondrous economy of God's grace in the life, sufferings and death of Christ, and the institutions and experiences of the Church; but it does all this more fully and satisfactorily than we have seen it done elsewhere, and does it with the aid of the best German works on the same theme. There is a good deal of minute philological criticism, in connection with copious exposition, valuable explanation and ample reference to other parts of Scripture, all pervaded by a continuous thread of devout reflection, adapted to awake serious thought, profitable inquiry, and fruitful application in the reader. The work is one of a class which we like to have lying on our study table, close at hand, to be often opened. We recommend it to preachers, students, and readers generally, as a valuable aid to the right and profit-

able reading of that delightful portion of Holy Writ, the Book of Psalms.

Memoirs of the Life of James Wilson, Esq., F. R. S. E., M. W. S., of Woodville. By James Hamilton, D. D. F. L. S., Author of "Life in Earnest," "Mount of Olives," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.—1859.

To us this book has been very delightful reading. Written by one of the readiest and ablest pens in England, it tries to delineate a Christian gentleman, and to show how honorably and usefully an accomplished mind may fill up a life of leisure. The subject of this memoir was a brother of the celebrated Professor Wilson (Christopher North), and, having been early brought to a saving knowledge of Christ, labored long and faithfully, and, it is hoped, effectually, to bring that brother also to the covenant of God's grace in Christ. With congenial appreciation, Dr. Hamilton here narrates the life and portrays the character of his friend: a character of which the sweetest gentleness, true kindness, and ardent sympathy with every genuine human interest were the salient features, and which was displayed in a life of steadfast devotion to the true and the good, of the practical exemplification of the highest social virtues. The *employment* to which Mr. Wilson's life was devoted was Natural Science, in which he was a laborious, prolific and most instructive writer; some of the most important contributions in the English language to that science being the productions of his pen. He was a man of singular modesty and refinement: a good part of this memoir consists of his own letters and other productions of his pen; and we are persuaded that all, who are capable of appreciating such a character and of sympathizing with the pleasure derived from the scientific and loving study of nature, will find this volume a most agreeable and instructive companion for the long winter evenings.

Life in Jesus: a Memoir of Mrs. Mary Winslow, arranged from her Correspondence, Diary and Thoughts. By her Son, Octavius Winslow, D. D., Author of "Midnight Harmonies," "Personal Declension and Revivals," "The Precious Things of God," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. No. 530 Broadway.—1860.

The editor of these memoirs is well known to the religious public in America through his writings. The subject of the memoir, an English lady, and twice a resident of this country, was no ordinary woman. Possessed of a strong and highly cultivated mind and great force of character, she necessarily exerted a powerful influence upon all with whom she came in contact; and with her profound convictions of the solemn importance of man's temporal and eternal relations and interests, and

with her large views of human duty thence arising, she sought to extend the scope of that influence, and to bring it strongly to bear upon every point of society which she could reach. Of course, however, the great charm and value of her life consist in the profoundly religious, character that pervades it: in the high tone of piety, of rigidly consistent christian practice that constituted its predominant element to the end of a career, checkered with many and various experiences, and many of the bitterest trials which the heart of man can be called to bear. This is one of those lives which eminently demonstrate what the grace of God in the Gospel can do for, and in man's fallen nature: one of those characters upon which we look with admiring and loving awe. The son has here faithfully and well performed his duty to the memory of such a mother, avoiding that extravagant coloring which filial affection is so prone to employ, and yet not erring, through excessive and timid caution, in the opposite extreme; and allowing his parent, in a great measure, to portray her own character, by quoting largely from her letters and diary, and by communicating her thoughts, as she was wont freely to express them. It is an admirable book for home circles, and for families, where young people are growing up into the earnest pursuits and momentous duties of mature life.

A Natural Philosophy: embracing the most recent Discoveries in the various branches of Physics, and exhibiting the application of Scientific Principles in every-day Life. Adapted to use with or without apparatus, and accompanied with full descriptions of experiments, practical exercises, and numerous Illustrations. By G. P. Quackenbos, A. M., Principal of "The Collegiate School," N. Y.: Author of "First Lessons in Composition," "Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric," "Illustrated School History of the United States," etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 346 & 348 Broadway.—MDCCCLX.

We have long regarded Mr. Quackenbos as one of the ablest and most successful instructors in our country, as possessing not only a thorough knowledge of the subjects which he undertakes to teach, but the utmost efficiency in communicating to young minds the treasures of his own. This facility of communication, this practical tact in teaching, and this well trained skill in directing the efforts of earnest pupils, are manifest in all his school books, and the one before us cannot fail still more to raise and extend the author's well earned fame. The present work is characterized by thorough and accurate knowledge, a perfectly systematic arrangement and succession of subjects, rigid adherence to an admirable and lucid method of instruction, great clearness of statement, ample illustration, explanations so simple and luminous as to

bring the science within the grasp of even feeble minds, and a felicitous exhibition of the application of facts and principles to the practical affairs and pursuits of every-day life. We have, ere this, had occasion to commend other school books designed to teach this important science, but we would certainly, if again required to give such instruction ourselves, prefer the work before us to all others with which we are acquainted : the more so because it is not a collection merely of scientific facts, principles and rules—a mass of dry bones—but a course of instruction, instinct with life and stimulating interest.

The Higher Christian Education. By Benjamin W. Dwight, Author of "Modern Philosophy, its History, Discoveries and Results." New York: A. S. Barnes & Burr. 51 & 52 John St.—1859.

We have read this book with the highest satisfaction. The author is himself a distinguished instructor and educator of youth, and his work is the production of a highly cultivated mind, the utterance of a truly earnest spirit, the fruit of large experience and profound thought, and the expression of a truly just appreciation of the dignity, the responsibility, the nobleness and importance of the teacher's calling. The book is thoroughly pervaded by the great principles of our Holy Religion ; exhibits elaborately, under a variety of divisions and subdivisions, the true nature of the higher christian education ; deals faithfully and severely with existing abuses ; presents to instructors the highest aims ; and points out the purest and strongest motives to strive after the utmost efficiency in the discharge of their momentous duties, and thus to cheer and encourage them under the depressing difficulties and obstacles and even indignities, which so often beset their laborious career. The book is replete with a sound truly Christian philosophy, and we heartily recommend it to all instructors of youth, and not only to professed pedagoges, but equally to fathers and mothers. It may do them all good.

Modern Philology: Its Discoveries, History and Influence, with Maps, Tabular Views, and an Index. By Benjamin W. Dwight, Author of "The Higher Christian Education." New York: A. S. Barnes & Burr. 51 & 53 John St.—1859.

The author of this work says in his Preface : "The articles, composing the present volume, were published : the first and third, at different times, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and the second in the *New Englander* ; and were much compressed in their details, in order to adapt their length to the limits of those valuable *Quarterlies*." Upon these articles, as they appeared from time to time, the highest commendations were bestowed by eminent scholars and leading periodicals. They have since

been re-written and greatly enlarged and improved, and are accompanied with philological maps and tabular views of great interest. The volume displays extensive and profound scholarship, the fruit of acute and comprehensive research, and it supplies a great desideratum to the students of language among us, young and old. It will have a deep interest not only for students of language, but to general readers who crave information concerning the intellectual history of our race. It is fitted also for study and recitation in schools and colleges, and will be welcomed by students of history, philosophy, and language, as a most valuable aid in the pursuit of these important studies.

The Puritans: or the Church, Court, and Parliament of England, during the reign of Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth. By Samuel Hopkins. "The liberties of our House, it behoveth us to leave to our Posterities in the same freedom we have received them." Committee of the Puritan Commons to the Lords, 1575-6. In three volumes. Vol. 1st. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington Square.

We have read this volume and found it intensely interesting. It has much of the attraction of a historical romance with the soberness of truth. The tenth chapter alone is worth more than the price of the book. We hope the remaining volumes will soon appear. We shall look for them with desire.

Deutsches Gesangbuch. Eine Auswahl geistiger Lieder aus allen Zeiten der Christlichen Kirche. Nach den besten hymnologischen Quellen bearbeitet und mit erläuternden Bemerkungen über die Verfasser, den Inhalt und die Geschichte der Lieder versehen, von Philipp Schaff, Doctor und Professor der Theologie. Philadelphia, Lindsay & Blakiston: Schäfer und Koradi. Berlin, Wiegandt & Grieben—1859.

A rich treasure, gathered by a highly gifted man! Many thanks are due thee by the lovers of the Sacred Muse of Germany. Our humble tribute accords thee much praise for thy work, judicious, tasteful, rich. Be not weary in well-doing.

We are pleased to see that our friends Smith, English & Co., are publishing an Edition of Stier's *Reden Jesu, Words or Discourses of Jesus*. It will be considerably cheaper than the Edinburgh Edition, and in half the number of volumes. The first part has appeared. This great work has already been so favorably noticed in our pages, particularly in the Review of our able Contributor, Dr. H. I. Schmidt, that we deem it unnecessary to give it any additional endorsement.

The Evangelical Psalmist: A collection of Tunes and Hymns for use in congregational and social worship. Venite, Exultemus Domino. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Bla-kiston—1860.

It is understood, that this volume is the joint production of J. A. Seiss, D. D., J. McCron, D. D., and Rev. W. A. Passavant, who have been, for several years, engaged in its preparation. This is the first effort of the kind, ever attempted in our Church, and the greatest care has been taken to produce a work, acceptable to the whole Church. The book is designed to be a manual of Sacred Music, adapted to the Hymns, at present in use in our Lutheran Churches, consisting of tunes printed with the Hymns, to which they may be appropriately sung. Although changes have been introduced, a few Hymns being added and others omitted, found in the General Synod's Book, yet the two can be conveniently used together in public or private worship. It is not proposed that the work shall supersede the collection, published by authority of the General Synod, but that it be adopted in connexion with it as an auxiliary, in promoting "the service of Song in the House of the Lord." There is also appended a large number of beautiful Chants and Anthems, which greatly enhance the value of the volume. The book will be found especially useful to Choirs and families, and will very much tend to improve the character of our Church music. When the project of publishing the work was first suggested, we did not see our way clear to encourage the effort, lest it might interfere with the excellent collection, at present used by most of our Churches, but on a careful examination of the volume and its design, we have come to the conclusion that its circulation will rather advance, than retard the circulation of the General Synod's book, and accomplish good. We have, therefore, no hesitation in expressing our gratification with the appearance of the work and in commending it to the favorable regard of our people.

African Bible Pictures: or Scripture Scenes and Customs in Africa. By Rev. M. Officer, Missionary to Western Africa. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication—1859.

This is an instructive little book, and should find its way into all our Sabbath School Libraries. Although prepared more particularly for the young, yet it may be read with profit by all. Not only is valuable information communicated, respecting the habits and usages of the Africans, but coincidences pointed out between them and the ancient heathen, mentioned in the Bible. Portions of the Scriptural narrative is thus made clearer and an additional interest imparted to the story of the Sacred Record.

Gleanings from the Harvest-fields of Literature, Science and Art, a melange of excerpts, curious, humorous and instructive. Collated by C. C. Bombaugh, A. M. M. D. Baltimore : T. Newton Kurtz—1860

We have been most agreeably disappointed in the character of this book. On examination we find it containing a vast amount of curious and valuable information, not accessible in any other single volume. Material has been gathered from innumerable sources, which canot fail to interest, entertain and instruct the reader. It is a book, designed for all classes and all seasons, and will prove useful for reference and pleasant to fill up odd moments of time.

The Life and Labors of the Rev. Daniel Baker, D. D., Pastor and Evangelist. Prepared by his son, Rev. William M. Baker, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Austin, Texas. Third Edition. Philadelphia : William S. & Alfred Martien—1859.

We have perused the volume, whose title page is given, with much satisfaction. It is a book of more than ordinary interest and may be read with profit by Christians of every name. The narrative of a most remarkable minister of the Gospel is given, whose labors were perhaps, more extensive, and accompanied with greater results than those of any one since the days of Whitefield. He was a man of evangelical, earnest spirit, of laborious, judicious effort, who kept continually before him the great object of life, and seemed to realize his great responsibilities. The love of Christ was the absorbing motive, always prominent and influencing him in all his actions, and the glories and blessedness of heaven seemed the constant subject of his thoughts and daily conversation. He was a man of one idea, and with this he commenced life. When he entered Princeton college in 1813, there were one hundred and forty-five students. Six were professors of religion, but only four appeared to be in earnest on the subject ; of these Dr. B., was one. Their prayers and efforts, on behalf of their unconverted associates in study, were owned and blessed by God. Forty-five, that session, were hopefully converted, nearly thirty of whom afterwards entered upon the work of preaching the Gospel. This earnest, zealous character Dr. B. manifested during his whole subsequent career, and many seals were given to his ministry. It is thought that twenty thousand souls were brought, through his instrumentality, under the influence of religious truth. The work is worthy of the favor, with which it has already been received. It will do good, wherever it circulates.

The Crucifixion of Christ. By Daniel H. Hill, Superintendent of the North Carolina Military Institute, and late Brevet Major in the United States Army. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien—1859.

The object of this volume is to establish the credibility of the Gospel narratives, by comparing the numerous incidental and undesigned coincidences, presented in the accounts of the four Evangelists. The author discovers correspondence and harmony, where others attempt to reconcile conflicting statements. The work is on the general plan of Paley's *Histoire Paulinæ*, and possesses great merit. It is one that is needed at the present day, and is suitable to be placed in the hands of a sceptic. Written by a layman, engaged in secular pursuits and having mingled with men of all classes and become familiar with their difficulties and objections to Revelation, the book is rendered more valuable. Whilst the previous training of the author has qualified him for the investigation of the subject, the argument is clear and satisfactory, the discussion earnest and forcible and the character of the work, practical and fitted to do good, wherever it is read.

Leaders of the Reformation: Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, the representative men of Germany, France, England and Scotland. By John Tulloch, D. D., Principal and Primarius Professor of Theology of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews', author of *Theism*, etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln—1859.

These sketches of leading men, in the history of the Reformation, have met with a favorable reception in this country as well as in Europe. They were originally delivered in the city of Edinburgh, in the presence of large audiences, and heard with great interest. We are not surprised at this, for the author has reproduced each one of these heroes with discriminating fidelity and striking success. A most interesting portraiture is given, accompanied with reflections of an instructive and liberal character, written in an attractive style. We like the book very much. Although unwilling to endorse every sentiment which it contains, we can cheerfully commend the volume to public favor.

Moral Philosophy, including Theoretical and Practical Ethics. By Joseph Haven, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary; lately Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Amherst College. Author of *Mental Philosophy*. Boston: Gould & Lincoln—1859.

A good text book in the department of Moral Philosophy has long been considered a *desideratum*. Most of the works, now in use, are in many respects unsatisfactory. Some are defective in a thorough discus-

sion of the principles, and others, in practical detail. In some, topics are discussed, entirely foreign to the subject of Moral Philosophy, while the history of ethical opinion is altogether passed over. The author of the present treatise, whose Mental Philosophy has been received by the public with so much favor, has endeavored to present not merely a treatise on moral subjects, but a *science* of morals. With a view to this, the principles, which are the basis of the science, are first concisely discussed and then these principles are examined in their application to the practical obligations and relations of human life. More attention than usual is also here given to Political Ethics, and yet no more than the importance of the subject demands, for in a free country like ours, young men should be carefully instructed in the principles of civil government and in the rights and duties of the citizen. We regard Dr. Haven's work as an excellent treatise, and well suited for a text book. Clearness of thought, perspicuity of arrangement, correctness of sentiment, richness of illustration characterize its pages and render its discussions attractive.

The Crucible: or tests of a regenerate State, designed to bring to light suppressed hopes, expose false ones and confirm the true. By Rev. J. A. Goodhue, A. M. With introduction by Rev. Edward N. Kirk, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln—1860.

Without subscribing to every sentiment, which the volume contains, we think the discussion is marked by great ability and is the result of much thought. Even those, who do not agree with the author in all his positions, will find the book deserving of their careful consideration. It is very much of the character and spirit of President Edwards' treatise on the Affections, and its perusal will advance the cause of genuine piety in our Churches. The work is addressed to all serious persons, but most especially to those, whose duty it is to guide and test the religious experience and hopes of those, placed within the reach of their influence. The subject is practical, yet involving principles of great magnitude, which should be thoroughly examined and clearly understood by all Christians.

A Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors, living and deceased. From the earliest accounts to the middle of the nineteenth century, containing thousand biographies and literary notices, with forty indexes of subjects. By S. Austin Allibone. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson, 602 Arch St.—1859.

After a careful examination of Mr. Allibone's Dictionary, it gives us pleasure to bear testimony to its excellencies. It is truly a great work,

and will be a permanent monument of the author's patient research, untiring industry and successful effort. As we turn over the pages with increasing satisfaction, we are surprised at the extent, minuteness and accuracy of the information communicated, and gratefully express our high sense of the value of the book. When we first heard of its plan, our expectations were sanguine in reference to the result, but these expectations are more than realized in the volume now before the public, and we are confident that the enterprise will meet with encouragement and patronage, corresponding to its merits. The work supplies a want that has been long felt, and every one possessing it will find it a most important contribution to the literature of our language. To the minister of the Gospel it will prove a great help in his studies. When prosecuting some interesting and useful subject of investigation, he will be at once, directed to the appropriate knowledge and furnished not merely with Mr. Allibone's opinions, but with the criticisms of the leading literary and scientific reviews of Great Britain and our own country. We are also gratified with the Christian feature of the work, and the desire evinced, on every proper occasion, to recommend the "truth as it is in Jesus." The reflections on Bolingbroke, Hume, Gibbon, Byron and others are most creditable, and cannot fail to exert a happy influence. Deeply sympathizing with the author in his arduous labors and sincerely trusting, that his health may be spared to complete the undertaking, so successfully commenced, we cordially commend the work to public attention.

Annals of the American Pulpit; or commemorative notices of distinguished American clergymen of various denominations, from the earliest settlement of the country to the close of the year eighteen hundred and fifty-five. With Historical introductions. By William B. Sprague, D. D. Vol. VI. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers—1860.

We have, on several occasions, spoken of Dr. Sprague's valuable services and commended his great work to the attention of our readers. Every successive volume, as it issues from the press, increases our admiration of the author, and convinces us of his eminent abilities for the laborious and difficult work, in which he is engaged. Perhaps there is no other man in the country, so well fitted for the task. Possessing a combination of qualifications, not often found in a single individual, he has in addition succeeded in enlisting in his service some of the most gifted and best educated men, who furnish the most interesting and important information, respecting their contemporaries and associates. The volume before us, the sixth of the series, contains the Biographies of the Baptist Pulpit and is not inferior in interest to any of the five octavos previously published. The materials are varied

and abundant, full of rich instruction, pleasing incidents and deep religious experience, and the author has executed his part with the same energy, patience, impartiality and gracefulness, which characterize all the productions of his pen. He is steadily progressing in his labors, and we anticipate with interest and eagerness the two volumes, yet remaining, to complete the undertaking. The volumes ought to find a place, as they richly deserve, in the Library of every minister of the Gospel and intelligent Christian in the land.

A brief Scriptural argument on the prominent features of the Abrahamic Covenant, showing its connection with the Christian Dispensation. By Rev. W. G. Harter, Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jeffersontown, Ky. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz, No. 151 West Pratt Street —1860.

Written without sectarian bigotry or the purpose of subserving denominational interests, the author expresses the sincere hope, that such a work may contribute to the enlightenment of the ignorant and to vindicate the injured rather than commit the least act of aggression, and to relieve a certain class from embarrassment upon the subject of Infant Baptism.

Lutheran Almanac for 1860. Baltimore: Published and Sold by T. Newton Kurtz. No. 151 Pratt Street, opposite the Maltby House.

Der Lutherische Kalender für das Jahr 1860. Allentown, Pa., Gedruckt und herausgegeben von Pastor S. K. Brobst.

Both exceedingly valuable, as Almanacs, as vehicles of various instructive and edifying articles on subjects pertaining to man's highest interests, as repositories of Church, statistics of indisputable value, and Clerical registers of almost daily use. Deserving extensive patronage in the Church and out of it, to those who would know what Lutheranism in this country is, we cordially recommend them to public patronage.

Lindsay and Blakiston have published in the Series No. 10 of Herzog's Encyclopaedia.